

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

JULY, 1927

TOWARD MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

The righteous is a guide to his neighbor.—Prov 12:26.

For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours.—I Cor. 3:21-22.

Books are but shadows caught from human life as it moves inexorably across the motionless background of time. No sooner are they cast than their originals of flesh and blood move on to project other shadows, much the same, it may be, yet inevitably different. Only he who resolutely dispels the common illusion that writers of books stand imprisoned in their shadows may read the book of Life. Not from tomes of bygone years, and not even from books and papers of the immediate past, if these are all, can we as Christians learn to know each other. We need to meet face to face.

Being shadows, books have an uncanny power to deceive by distortion. Now they exaggerate, again they dwarf; often they leave out whole significant areas of life and thought. Even at their best, they are mere patches, shrunk and torn from the context of life. Whenever, therefore, one finds himself dependent upon literary sources of information about his fellow Christians, it is well to read widely, not only what others *have said* about them, but what *they are saying* about themselves.

For these reasons the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY counts itself fortunate in being able to present to its readers five addresses delivered at the Pennsylvania State Conference on Faith and Order, which was held May 17 and 18 in the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the World's Conference on Faith and Order, the Pennsylvania State Council of Churches, and the Ministerial Association of Harrisburg. Its purpose was "to prepare the people of Pennsylvania for the work of the World Conference to be held at Lausanne, Switzerland, August 3 to 27, 1927, and to make possible a better understanding and a closer co-operation on the part of the Protestant churches of the State." The writers of these addresses are the Reverend J. A. W. Haas, D.D., Allentown, Pa., President, Muhlenberg College (Lutheran); Alfred C. Garrett, Ph.D., Philadelphia, Pa. (Friend); the Rev. J. M. M. Gray, D.D., Scranton, Pa. (Methodist Episcopal); the Reverend G. W. Richards, D.D., Lancaster, Pa., President, Reformed Church Seminary; and the Reverend Walter J. Houge, D.D., York, Pa. (Presbyterian).

Our readers will note that the conference at Harrisburg did not tear questions of "faith and order" loose from those of "life and work." Some insist that a common expression of faith and doctrine must precede co-operation in life; to others such unity is hopelessly beyond us: they are convinced that we must begin by agreeing to work together more closely in our common Christian enterprise. Whether agreement in the one case will be any easier than in the other is a fair question. But one thing is certain: we shall never build the Celestial Railway by laying the rail of "faith and order" at right angles with that of "life and work"; and if we lay a mile of one and twice that length of the other we shall run our train just *one* mile after all—unless, indeed, we continue the journey on a monorail and get a gyroscope for a balance! Certainly there are mountains in the way; but of the metals which go into the rail we can also forge the crowbar, and one no less than the

Chief Engineer of the Christian Enterprise has told us how to remove them forthwith.

A recent writer has expressed the fear that "divergent and divisive conceptions of the nature of the church will be temporarily—but *only* temporarily—lost sight of in the joy of a great fellowship; that questions which cannot be settled without being thought through will be blurred in a mist of sentimentality; and that lack of a conscious tolerance for differences will be obscured by a cheerful assumption that differences do not exist." While it may seem to many that the danger lies just the other way, namely, that certain differences of opinion may be exaggerated out of all proportion to their importance, it certainly is true that clear thinking and vigorous though kindly expression of religious convictions will be required on the part of both the clergy and the laity. The latter are becoming more and more disposed to acquaint the clergy with what they are thinking as, for example, Mr. T. B. Stork does in his article in this issue.

All this presupposes an appreciative interchange of religious experiences between the Christian denominations and between the various groups within these denominations themselves. With this twofold object in view the present issue of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY was projected.

In carrying out the second part of the plan, namely, that of presenting comparative statements of the present position of the several Lutheran bodies in America, we have had hearty co-operation, and we take this opportunity to acknowledge the assistance of their leaders. The writers are the Reverend L. A. Vigness, editor of *Lutheranen*, official organ of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America; the Reverend Andreas Helland of the faculty of Augustburg Seminary of Minneapolis; the Reverend W. Arndt, Professor of New Testament, Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, and the Reverend Oscar N.

Olson of the Augustana Synod, editor of the *Lutheran Companion*.

Since the histories often are most concerned to describe Lutherans to each other *as they once were*, we trust that what these contributors have written will serve to give us a better understanding of each other *as we now are*. Differences there are, to be sure, but that they are not such as to prevent our working together at our common task, will appear from President Aberly's account of co-operation in Foreign Mission work.

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

(I)

J. A. W. HAAS

ALLENTOWN, PA.

There are two well known formulas in which the relation of the Lord to His Church is commonly expressed. The first is—*Ubi Christus ibi Ecclesia* and the second is *Ubi Ecclesia ibi Christus*. There is truth in both of these approaches to the problems of the Church. Wherever Christ is, there He gathers about Him through the power of His Spirit those who believe in Him. And wherever the Church is, even if but two or three are gathered, there Christ is in the midst of them. Nevertheless there is also a certain danger in the undue emphasis at the outset upon the Church as guaranteeing the Christ unless we are very careful to define what the Church is. So many senses and meanings are given to the idea of the Church that it needs careful statement. If we begin with Christ and remain alone with Him in His value and import for the individual, we shall find no real place for the Church; we shall degrade it, and we shall also take away from Christ what He is to men in their social togetherness.

The starting point for the understanding of the Church must lie in the realization that it is the result of the creative power of Christ through His Spirit. The Church is from above and not from below. It comes to men from the Father through the revelation and creative power of the Spirit. The only place where Jesus Himself speaks of the Church in its universal aspect occurs in Matthew the sixteenth chapter. He promises the founding of His Church after Peter has confessed Him as the Son of the Living God. This statement Jesus designates as coming through the revelation of the

Father. Jesus is not only the very life of the Church as confessed by the faith of Peter but the faith itself is called forth from above. The Church is no creation brought about through the agreement of men who determine to form an organization. Its origin at Pentecost proves this in the very symbols of that day. The rushing of the great wind betokens the spirit of Christ. The flames of fire of the heads of Apostles signify the fulfillment of the promise of the baptism by the Spirit which will bring about the living testimony and the message that shall lead men into the Church. It is thus that the power of the Spirit clothed in the Word of God becomes the creative power taking Christ and what is His to produce the Church as a living organism.

The Church is thus born in the hearts of men. It is "a fellowship of faith and the Holy Ghost in hearts."¹ It is an inward, spiritual unity of men in Christ. Faith is not only an individual relation and attitude of the soul to Christ, but it is also a socially uniting power. In its full reality the trust in Jesus brings men together. It is in this way that the Spirit uses the believing attitude of the heart toward Christ by bringing it into relation with other hearts that accept Christ. There is a social formative power in the love of the Christian. It is not only a fact that Christians love the Christ and His Father, but also that in loving the God of love they dwell in love and love each other. In like manner the Christian hope is not a mere individual expectancy, but a common looking forward to the great fulfillment of the Church triumphant.

It is very essential in the effort to understand the nature of the Church to realize that it must be defined altogether in terms of life and not of organization. It is thus that St. Paul uses the figure of the Church as the Body of Christ. It is out of the body as a totality that he determines the place of the individual members (Eph. 5:30). Into this body there flows the fullness of Christ, the Head. The whole conception is that of a liv-

1 *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Chapter four.

ing, organic unity of a spiritual kind. The same picture of life appears in the manner in which John portrays the life of the believers in Christ as like unto the life of the branches of a vine in the vine (John 15). Christ is the vitalizing source and life of the Church. It is remarkable that when Paul also uses the picture of the Church as a habitation of God through the Spirit, as a holy temple, he tends to stress two points. First, the certainty of the Church's foundation upon Christ and the Apostles (Eph. 2:20ff). Secondly, this building of the Church to be erected upon the foundation consists of living souls, pictured as living stones to be put into the spiritual structure of the Church by its ministers (I Cor. 3:9). It is this living relationship by which the members of the Church become an elect people, a holy nation and a royal priesthood. (I Peter 2:9).

If we have rightly conceived this living, spiritual, mystical reality of the Church we shall also be ready to apprehend the secret of its existing unity. In the great epistle of Paul to the Ephesians we find a marvelous development of the ideal of the Church universal. Beginning in eternity with the counsel of God and His predestination of His children unto adoption in Christ, and with the glorification of the redemption wrought by Christ, Paul stresses the word of truth, namely the Gospel of Salvation. Through this living word that imparts the Christ, as the Head of the Church, the Church becomes filled with all the fullness of the life and power and glory of Christ (Eph. 1). This fullness of power saving us from sin brings nigh Jews and Gentiles through the peace of the cross and thus founds the one living spiritual temple (Eph 2). A great fellowship of one family in heaven and earth, in which hearts joined in faith comprehend the breadth, depth, length and height of divine love, is created (Eph. 3). It is thus that the Church is one body resting on one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father, and has the precious gift of its ministers who speak the truth in love, that the whole church fitly joined together may edify itself in love

(Eph. 4). Mightily Paul leads us to the contemplation of the unity and catholicity of the Church emanating from God the Father and fulfilled in Christ the Head as He is made a reality through the Spirit.

There is another figure in which the Church is shown in the unity of love. It is the picture of the Church as a chaste virgin espoused to Christ (2 Cor. 11:2). It is a glorious Church which Christ loves and for which He has given Himself, that He might make it glorious, holy and without blemish (Eph. 5:25-27). The Church is a pure bride, the wife of the Lamb (Rev. 21:9). The import of all these symbols is that there is a spiritual unity between Christ and the Church, the unity of love. The whole aspect is again one of a mystical inwardness. And therefore there is a unity of the Church in the life that is common to all believers in the one Lord. They are spiritually and inwardly one in Christ and find their actual, invisible unity in the faith and love in which Christ is in the Father and the Father in Him (John 17:21, 23, 26). Just as the unity of the Son and the Father are inward and not visible, so there is in the same manner a fellowship that consists in the "inward communion of eternal blessings in the heart, as of the Holy Ghost, of faith, of the fear and love of God."² This is the essential and real unity of the Church, which we confess in the Apostles Creed when we say "I believe in one Holy Catholic Church." We believe, but we do not see this one Holy Catholic Church. The Church itself is a matter of faith and not of sight.

There are only two ways in which the Church enters into outwardness. The very Word which creates it becomes audible, and through it and its preaching there is as a resultant a certain exhibited mark of the inwardly existing Church. It is this same Word which is creative in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Wherever this Word is purely preached and Baptism and the Lord's Supper are rightfully administered there certainly is the Church. It can be recognized by these outward evidences. The

2 *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Chapter four.

Church becomes the congregation of saints and continues as such not through any thing that is essential in its outwardness as outwardness. But men know it as the Church "in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered."³

As far then as there is any outward manifestation of the inner spiritual unity of the Church it ought to exhibit itself through its essential marks which bring it into the external world. It is right here where all work of unity and all effort at getting together externally must begin. "To the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments."⁴ Where this unity is reached in confession as the expression of the inner unity, all other problems are minor. It ought to be possible for all the separate groups to maintain traditions of government and freedom, and yet at the same time to be willing to come to some common understanding in the matters that do not affect the essential life of the Church. Let us come to an agreement as far as possible on the Church in its inner existence as a fact now here, and then let us strive for greater expression of agreement in the truth of the divine Word.

³ *Augsburg Confession, Article VII.*

⁴ *Augsburg Confession, Article VII.*

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

(II)

ALFRED C. GARRETT

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The fundamental nature of the Church seems well depicted in our Lord's illustration of the vine and its branches; those are truly members of Him in whom the sap, or life essence flows, so that they produce the fruits. Similar is St. Paul's figure of the body, with its head, and all its organs and limbs—those persons are part of this body in whom the life-blood and the nerve-energy of the whole organism are found, by virtue of which alone can they do the works directed by the head. Of course in a vine branches may be grafted as well as originally grown there; the vital connection is the thing, as evinced by growth and greenness, and fruit; if the vital connection is lacking, the church dries up; it is not part of the church.

What is this fruit that attests the vital connection, and a real membership in the Church? Is it not the fruit of the Spirit? For the Spirit of Christ is the current of life that must flow through all, the sap, the blood, the nerve-energy and essence of life; as St. Paul says, "If any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." He is a severed branch. Wherever then we see a man with a faith born of the Spirit, with a courage and utterance given by the Spirit to declare his faith in Christ, such as St. Peter had at his Great Confession, we have a true member. St. Peter, at his Confession, we might say, was the only member of the Church, the first man who satisfied the heart of Christ as showing the true fruit of His travail; with this first member, the Church was born. St. Paul further describes the fruit: wherever we find men who show forth "love, joy, peace, long-

suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control"—proceeding from their relation to the living Christ by His Spirit, there we recognize true members of His Church, those who are in vital connection with Him.

Professor Glover of Cambridge reminds us that "in every age and land the great Christian community has had the gift of producing a high and great type of character"; and he wishes that "instead of a history of the Church a history of Christian character might be written"; for this is the great *continuum* of the Church—one of the deepest elements of its unity. That homely remark, quoted, I believe, from a pagan observer of the early Church, "How these Christians love each other" comes very near the heart of the matter. Might one not even dare to say that, as a test of membership in the true Church, that homely observation is more important than the Apostles' Creed? For it is nearer the teaching of Jesus. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one for another." In that we see our invisible unity made visible and producing faith in the unbelieving world. It is for such "revealing of the sons of God" as a closely knit divine Commonwealth "that the whole creation waits with earnest expectation."

Now we find such men as these in all communions today, radiant Christian faces, lives whose work is kindness, in Catholic Communions as well as Protestant; in all the other Protestant Communions as well as in one's own. These are the true Church,—if only we could unite them all, as they recognize each other with a smile and the hand-clasp of brotherhood, and could give them the rule in the great re-union that we seek, our task would be accomplished; they would bind the whole together.

Here, however, we have to recognize that the above picture is rather of the mystical, invisible Church, than of the actual, organized, visible bodies with which we have to deal. If we regard this invisible Church as comprising all the like-minded in heaven and earth, we may say, as Professor Bruce did, that this is the same as the

Kingdom of God. Professor Stevens of Yale gives the relationship of the two. "The Kingdom," he says, "is the invisible Church . . . (It) belongs to the realm of the spirit, and the tests of membership are absolute; the *ecclesia* is the human society into which men who profess to acknowledge the law of the Kingdom and the rule of the King unite themselves in order to give the truths of the Kingdom visible, concrete expression in human life and action." A considerable element of human imperfection is introduced here.

Nevertheless, through the apostolic age, the Spirit of Christ was still actively dominant in the actual visible Church. The Church at Corinth is typical. It is in an exceptional degree in vital connection with the Head of the Church; the tides of His life flow in it with extraordinary enthusiasm and power; men and meetings are filled with the Spirit, and the members speak in great variety and democratic freedom when assembled. There is no one leader; none seems needed in their joyous exuberant life under Christ their Head; but above all, characteristic of the time is the presence of the prophets: of the early Christian prophets who speak as the Spirit gave them utterance, and of the "prophetic utterance" with its threefold manifestation—the prophets proper, the evangelists, and the teachers—all Spirit-filled, and serving in their respective proportions under that heavenly impulse. Side by side with this prophetic ministry is growing another three-fold ministry, men also actuated by the Spirit, but usually in quieter and more practical ways, and having to do with distribution of alms, with shepherding, perhaps, and administration and the like. These men are more under appointment by their fellow members, and so are sometimes called the official ministry. They represent the beginning of the organization of the Church, and the greater part of the future lies in their hands.

And now we might enter the long course of development, the increasing elaboration of organization of the first three or four centuries to meet the vastly increasing

numbers of adherents and pressure of problems. Where the number of Christians was at first counted by thousands, soon they were counted by millions, and a much stronger leadership must be developed, while with these numbers came in strange philosophies and remnants of pagan ritual, seeming to demand closer creeds as safeguards, and, as points of contact with pagans, more elaborate Christian ritual. Here again imperfection might creep in. But we will not further pursue our first point concerning the nature of the Church, that it should be pervaded and controlled by the Spirit of Jesus as proven by the fruits.

Our second point will now be that the nature of the Church must show diversity to meet differences of human need. We all decry uniformity, but much that is said even of union smacks of a great merger with much uniformity about it.

When St. Paul says he is "all things to all men that he may save some," he suggests diversity of method to meet differences of need, and when he further declares that "There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit, and diversities of ministrations (or administrations) but the same Lord, and there are diversities of working, but the same God who worketh all things in all" is he not describing the germinal stage of a large part of the elaboration and complexity that was to follow? The question is how far shall the diversities go? Which of them is right, and which is merely controversial, sectarian, and wrong? And the secret of preserving rightness in this matter seems suggested by the same apostle when he urges that we give diligence to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"—so that diversities should be held within the bounds of harmony and peace; and they must still all be preserved by the Spirit of Jesus which will give them the oneness for which He prayed. To secure "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" appears to be one of the best definitions of our task; taken in conjunction with what is known of St. Paul's exper-

ience and teaching, it must be held to imply considerable inner diversity.

Dr. McGiffert years ago pointed out that there were two denominations in Christianity from near the beginning of the Apostolic Age, that they were agreed to by the Apostles, and seem to have been formed under the leading of the Holy Spirit. When "the pillar apostles" gave the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul at the end of his First Missionary Journey, they agreed that their ministrations should be diverse; Paul should go to the Gentiles; Peter, James and others to the Jews; and this involved diversity of doctrine as regards the law, and diversity of practice of the law and its ceremonies; and they amicably consented to these differences, nay more, agreed to them. There were really two denominations. The Apostles "agreed to differ." And I cannot but feel that unless we accept the same concept of the nature of the church in large degree, of a great organism in which there is much "diversity in unity," until we *agree to differ*, we shall not make the progress desired; for certain differences are inherent in human nature and in human need, and the Church must meet them by diversity of ministrations.

Thus what may prove the most deep-seated difficulty to universal unity, for instance, the fact that Catholic Communions for the most part have a static concept of Christianity, while Protestants as a rule hold that Christianity is a living organism always growing from within, may only be met by definitely agreeing to differ. Just as the pillar apostles gave the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul, each agreeing to go to their respective fields of work, so Catholic leaders might give the right hand of fellowship to Protestantism, and the two agree to pursue separate tasks. Can we not all feel the value of having large sections of the Church hold to our anchorages in the past, in times of vast change, as the static concept does? Equally might a generous toleration be needed, in order to include some smaller dissentient sects.

The two denominations of the early church which have

been mentioned must, however, be sharply distinguished from the controversial differences criticized by St. Paul in First Corinthians: "I am of Paul; I of Apollos, I of Cephas, and I of Christ." These were partisanships; they were not mutually agreed to; there was no unity in their diversity—the "bond of peace" was not there to make them one; the Spirit of Christ did not pervade them as a single organism. This condition could have been avoided by demanding that the fruit of the Spirit, "love joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness," etc., should be found between them; it was not there in adequate degree. The branches were partly severed, and the life-flow checked.

A consideration which gives one a sense of the oneness of the Christian Church, and a willingness to agree to differences of ministration is to notice how those differences developed by growing up from the single root, like a tree of God expanding outward and upward. It is scarcely possible to describe this so as to be true of all places and periods of the early Church at any one time, since development differed in order and character in different parts. But I trust we shall not be far astray in some such general terms as the following. Taking the first period of the Church's ministration, there was in the first century, as we have seen, the three-fold prophetic ministry, and, developing, also the three-fold official ministry. By degrees the spirit of prophecy began to grow cool, the voices of the prophets to cease, and the official ministry came forward into more prominence and importance, taking over in time the functions of teaching and preaching. Ministration and administration were then in their second stage, i. e., after the prophetic period, elders or presbyters—and these in independent congregations. Are we wrong in saying that this stage of development corresponded roughly and in part to the Independent or Congregational type? Next, when the exigencies of a growing Church required some combination of congregations, the group of elders became a more definite ruling body or presbytery, with a presiding elder, and we have something resembling the presbyterian pol-

ity. But expansion continues; multitudes are joining the Church; the group of leaders has vast responsibilities thrust upon it; its members must distribute themselves and organize more helpers; the presiding presbyter takes on more executive and centralized functions; he has become a superintendent of a number of churches. The priestly concept of ministry is at the same time growing; the presbyters are becoming priests; till at last the presiding elder has become a bishop presiding over a diocese of priests. Is this not something like an Episcopal stage of development? When the bishoprics covered the Roman Empire and the bishops came together in conference, they were at first grouped under some such leaders as Metropolitans or Patriarchs, till one of them emerged as leader of the whole, the Bishop of Rome, who as coming from the capital of the Empire, was conceded the largest supremacy, and was in time called Pope. The example of the political organization of the Roman Empire meanwhile found more or less imitation in the organization of the great Church, and so the Catholic polity has been reached, indeed the Roman Catholic. This whole development is accomplished in the first three or four centuries of the Church's life. Passing over to the Protestant Reformation, the process was reversed; in the early centuries, there had been increasing complexity to meet increasing needs; in the Reformation there was a progressive simplification to eliminate the needless, passing from the Roman Catholic to Lutheran polity, and that of the Church of England, through Reformed and Presbyterian, to Independent or Congregational, and Baptist, down to the simplest of all, just before the year 1700, that of the Spirit-led prophetic type of the Quakers, in some ways resembling the first century of the Church. The great Wesleyan movement of the 18th century was a secondary simplification in the Church of England.

Now such a survey helps me, as representing the simplest type of polity, to realize our oneness in the Spirit of Christ. Does this not also show that we all belong together as one growth? I must concede an honest aim in

each age, under the constant impulse of the inner divine life, to meet the growing needs of Christendom. It is not for me, as a Quaker, to deny the possible need of an episcopate to lead effectively that vast Church, only I must contend for a place for the continued liberty of the Spirit within the jurisdiction of that episcopate. One must concede that the 600,000,000 of the Church to-day may need a yet mightier leadership, only one must contend that the future Church is to be democratic in spirit and form of polity, the democracy of one organization, spirit-filled throughout its membership as well as ministry, by the life-flow of the world Vine, which is Christ.

While discussing variety in unity, we have not yet considered how great the variety should be; should one hundred or two hundred "varieties of religious experience" be represented by as many varieties of polity, as we see at present; or by two as in the early Church; or by only one? This is a matter in which one can only offer individual suggestion.

Let us, however, make an attempt. The varying types of Christianity have been classified according to the ultimate reference of authority, the ultimate basis of truth: there is first the type which rests ultimately upon the traditions and decisions of the Church; we call it the Catholic type. There is next the type which refers ultimately or primarily to the Bible as its basis of authority and truth; this we call the Protestant type. There is conceivably in the third place, the type which refers ultimately for authority and truth to the witness of the Spirit in the heart and mind. I would call this the mystical type, taking mysticism as the tendency which finds the deepest and truest things in the hidden, interior life of the soul. The fourth, if we can admit it, would be the type which finds its ultimate reference for truth in the reason, the rationalist type, Unitarianism, and those groups which tend toward it, would lie near this type; it also suggests the large and increasing numbers who feel they can only admit to their faith things which are in accord with the assured results of science. Each of

these four definitions may indeed be thought open to criticism, partly because few actual churches conform to type; they usually show combinations of types; something, moreover, of each is found in all. Thus may we not say that the Episcopal communion as a whole lies somewhere between the purely Protestant and the purely Catholic, or is a combination of the two? Protestantism itself increasingly recognizes the witness of the Spirit, even if ancillary to the Bible. Quakerism similarly, while at heart mystical, is a combination of the Protestant type, acknowledging almost equal authority in the Bible and the Spirit. And we all claim the use of reason and science, although in subordination; we concede as well the value of Church history and the decisions of united groups of Christians in the past. Thus if we admit three intermediate forms of faith and order between the four typical ones first mentioned, we have the sacred number seven as a basis for discussion. Some such diversities seem to be based in essential diversities of human nature and need; and if so, the universal Church if true to her historic and real nature, should agree to admit some such degree of diversity in her great single organism.

The third and final leading characteristic of the Church of which I would speak is its democratic nature. Ever since Christ said, "One is your Master, and all ye are brethren," there has been a deeply democratic vein in the nature of the Church; it is a brotherhood; he who is the most able of all is to humble himself and serve others the most of all. There is really no place for haughty prelacy in this. Those in highest office are to be most especially the servants of all, and subject to all. The decisions of the body, it would seem, should therefore come from the mass of brethren below. The Church is in its very fibre democratic; and in the future how can it long remain monarchical or imperial, if it is not to become obsolete and out of touch with the world it is to serve? Its model should no longer be a Roman Empire, rather perhaps a League of Nations, a League of Democ-

racies. For what is the meaning of all these vanishing kingdoms and empires of the last ten years? Why do the newly modelled peoples, in setting up their new nationalisms choose to form republics, elect democratic institutions? Why do those who still aspire to nationalism also look forward to democratic forms? Is it not that democracy is coming into the world like a flood? A universal Church surely cannot ignore this drift; it will rather move forward as part of it. The Church will somehow be democratic in the end.

This being so, I would submit that the real stuff of the Church is the mass of its members. The real material of which we have to forge a unity is not its ministry—pastors, priests or bishops; the material to be united is not creeds, or governments or ceremonies, ordinations or sacraments; it is *men*; it is the minds and hearts of the rank and file of the men who compose it. These must be brought closer together, wrought into a greater fellowship.

Does it ever come over you that perhaps we may be on a wrong track, attempting this great task in too hard a way? To try to find a universally applicable ministry, or a single simple creed of essentials, or a harmonious administration of sacraments that will be acceptable to all, seems to me to be beginning at the wrong end. When closely approached, it also seems an almost hopeless task. Perhaps this task of ours is not altogether a matter either of Faith or of Order. If the Church is a democracy, perhaps we should also harmonize the mass of members, and then ultimately they will work out the solution of those harder problems. A harmonious membership will eventually bring forth, in a democratic organism, a harmonious ministry. At least, the laity might say, "Leave it to us. We will commit to the clergy, to ecclesiastical experts, the task of wrestling with the almost impossible problems of creed, and ordination, and sacrament. Meantime we must all become better acquainted, find the common Christian life in all; we are learning to work together; we must also learn to worship together; learn

the blessedness, the enlargement of heart, of bowing before a common Father at one another's altars."

Is it not easier for most men to learn to worship together than to agree to a common creed or ministry or ceremonial? Worship seems irenic; these other subjects seem controversial. Which looks to be the more fruitful path of progress? Moreover, the plan of promoting worship together is already under way. How often we worship at one another's shrines, and find true prayer, and the divine presence in every place; as well as in missions, at home or abroad, where we unite in services of worship. Those who remove and settle in the territory of a church other than their own are kindly received and enjoy the fellowship of work and worship; indeed in some churches they are given a kind of sojourning or associate membership as long as they remain. This, I would suggest, might be especially encouraged and enlarged, as part of our labor for unity—drawing together and weaving together the masses of the members of Christ. True, we must not encourage a wandering Christian life; but as is said by one of us, Dr. Ainslee of Baltimore, "holding *inter-church membership*, in different churches at the same time, would rebuke sectarian pride and make for complete fellowship among Christians which is now impossible." One might hope that in time a general Christian membership might arise which many would join who had never yet felt able to unite themselves with any existent sect. Thus the woof and weft of a seamless robe would be begun.

Worship together is often easy and inspiring; one of the deepest moments I remember was engaging in silent prayer with a Canon of the Church of England, a Roman Catholic nun, and an American Baptist, before the altar of the Chapel of the Ecce Homo-Arch in Jerusalem. Our eyes filled with tears together as we thought how close we stood to the spot where Christ had worn His crown of thorns. We were united in remembrance of the sufferings of Christ.

Once stopping at York, England, we decided to attend

the daily morning services in the great York Minster. As we settled into worship, the tall pillars like titanic clusters of crystals, reaching up into the haze and gloom above; the surgings of the mighty organ through long vistas of the Minster; the superb single voice of one of the greatest boy-singers of England, soaring above the choir through the lofty vaults and clere-stories above us, filling the whole vast building with thrilling echoes—perhaps above all, the huge stained glass windows of the choir, through which at the moment of climax in the music there came a burst of brilliant sunshine, so that a million multi-colored facets of light seemed like a thousand silent voices breaking forth in unison—all these in wonderful artistic harmony blending with the spirit of profound prayer and adoration, produced in me so overwhelming a spiritual effect as cannot be forgotten to my dying day. And the pale rapt face of one of the clergy, gazing in an ecstasy of worship up into the transfiguring lights, haunts me even now like a vision of Sainthood. The Quaker worshipped with all these; the extremes for once met. It has seemed to me in its small way a happy augury of the unity of Christendom.

THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM AND THE RELATION THERETO OF EXISTING CHURCHES

(III)

J. M. M. GRAY

SCRANTON, PA.

Under the subject which has been assigned to me, the first paragraph of explanation, supplied by the program committee, states the direction of thought involved so precisely that it may well be quoted: "The unity of a body, as St. Paul teaches, implies not uniformity but diversity; and therefore the Church, which is Christ's Body, should safeguard diversity within its unity."¹ Presumably that paragraph was introduced into the agenda in order to reassure cautious minds who might fear that the proposal for Church Unity would mean the absorption of all the varied historic societies and confessions into some one, inflexible order of thought and administration. I confess that it is not that fear which has fallen across my own thinking. To the contrary, it has seemed to me that the diversity of churches, each with its own proud history and proven usefulness in the discipline and maintenance of the human spirit, might prove an insuperable barrier to that acknowledged oneness of life in which the Church of a common Lord ought to express itself. For we shall make no progress toward the synthesis of all divergent forms of Christian faith and worship by discrediting the realities from which they have fallen, or the spiritual values which they have preserved.

It is easy and sometimes popular to remark the futility of the divisions of Protestantism, and to lament the impoverishment of the spiritual life because of their

1 See pamphlet of the World Conference on Faith and Order: *Specifications and Material for the Lausanne Programme*, No. 47, Rev. Jan. 24, 1927, p. 19. Publ. by the Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass.

unhappy rivalries; and there *have* been rivalries concerning which unhappy is a feeble word. But a comparison of the life of society in general during the period from the 13th to the middle of the 16th Century with that which has developed since will make very clear that, notwithstanding the advantages of unity in the one, and the tragedies of wars, doctrinal asperities, separations and even fanaticisms, in the other, religious life in this later era of Protestant divisions has been the more vital and productive. It has been the more expansive of the horizons of experience and appreciation, the more militant in its invasion of the areas of unexpected intellectual and social change, the more constant and persuasive in the strategy which captures new truth for the support of ancient faith.

It is religion as maintained and modulated in a divided Protestantism which has faced the inquisitions of modern science, and rebuilt its fundamental affirmations amid the debris of crumbling premises and the confusion of revolutionary discoveries. It is Protestantism, virile through the stimulus of its own varied forms, which has awakened the desire and inspired the struggle for democracy; not by oppression but by enlargement; and has made increasingly imperative the demand that religion coincide with all the relationships of human life. It is a divided Protestantism, more sympathetic toward practical human needs by reason of its sensitiveness to varying human moods, which has taken religion out of the sanctuary and associated it with the claims of human rights in industry, and the clamors of human wrongs from the inertias and impacts of congesting populations and the accumulating mechanisms of society and labor. It is Protestantism, divided, competitive, distracted, which has, nevertheless, disclosed Christ in compelling reality to pagan peoples, challenging their culture, disintegrating their philosophy, recreating their self-respect in new forms of racial pride and protest; and the storm which roars today across the ancient lethargies of the Orient is a witness to the effectiveness of the Gospel

which Protestantism, even as it is, has proclaimed and illustrated.

It has also been easy and sometimes popular to indict the insignificance of the theological and ethical differences which have begun, from time to time, the differences in Protestantism, following the great schism in which it took form under the hand of Martin Luther. But these greater divergences are not to be thus lightly dismissed by wise conformists who have inherited the proceeds of their forebears' conflicts without participating in their passion. Those differences which have given rise to the great denominations were something more than minority reports in the business meeting of a country club.

This is not the time to enter upon a discussion of the various convictions of belief and polity which have taken form in the organized churches which we represent; it is enough to remind ourselves that they were not such divergences of opinion as were neatly preserved in a secretary's record; they have been more indelibly registered in the prisons of non-conformists, the poverty of exiles, and the scaffolds of martyrs. Divisions for which brave men and women have died are not to be dismissed as the idle errors of enthusiasts. We agree, as the very presumption on which we have gathered here, upon the authentic and compelling value of Martin Luther; his secession has been the enrichment of the world. But shall we say less of Zwingli? The noble history of the Reformed Churches is the indisputable reply. No man can read the story of Cranmer's life and death without gratitude for the service which he rendered, and the spirit which, at last, he recovered out of cravenness, to inspire a bitter generation. His personal and political vacillations can be criticized at this safe distance; but the convictions which, in the end, he vindicated in the flames at Oxford, endure as an imperishable portion of the treasure of mankind. But who shall deny as much to John Wesley? Bishop Anderson, of Chicago, has justly remarked that the Methodists left the Anglican Church for reasons

which do that Church no credit; by so much, then, they do credit to the Methodists. And the Wesleyan Revival to which John Richard Green pays tribute, the labors of Asbury and the militant sacrifices of those Methodist pioneers who followed the American frontier from the Alleghanies to the Pacific, proclaim the reality of the Witness of the Spirit on behalf of which Methodism dared to accept the world as her parish. Can any man look into the face of John Knox, or hear his voice challenging a queen in Holyrood, or see the cruel countenance of Bloody MacKenzie sneering above his instruments of torture, or stand before the martyrs' monument in Greyfriars Churchyard where

"Lies the dust of those who stood
'Gainst perjury, resisting unto blood,
Adhering to the covenants and laws,"

and think less of Presbyterianism than that it is rooted in profound and inescapable realities which must still command the soul? The epic of Scrooby and the Mayflower and the Plymouth Colony, the Psalms of Cromwell's Ironsides at Marston Moor, the scaffold at Whitehall with a king's head on the block, are eloquent of those deep loyalties which burn undimmed in Congregationalism. No one who knows the heroic story of those independent spirits who furnished the last martyr to heresy in the fire of Litchfield, will think the Baptists' emphasis upon the liberty of the individual and the rigid distinction of believers rises from any shallower soil than conviction of truth and duty for which men are glad to die. And the Society of Friends, whose annals march to the music of oppression and are written in experiences of opprobrium and sacrifice, have not kept their inner light unshadowed, defying war to make them warlike, without a sense of personal communion with God and a divine leading of the mind, as unmistakable today as that which, in the past, mocked at persecution, and created the commonwealth of which we here are proud to be the sons.

Such distinctions as these must, indeed, be respected in whatever shall be the ultimate unity of the Church; and that, not alone because of their historic roots and heroic witness in the past; but because, also, they represent permanent differences, though not hostilities, in spiritual appreciation and concern. The old order changeth, giving place to new, and the conditions in which religion and the Church bear their witness are not the same from generation to generation. But the variations in the minds and temperaments of men are constant. There will always be intelligences to which the sacraments will be the surest expression of the presence of Christ; others in which the processes of theological discrimination will command primacy; and others which only the warmth of inner experience will arrest and motivate. There are moods and minds, and there will continue to be such, to which Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Episcopacy, alone will represent the aim and spirit of the New Testament Church. Always there will be earnest and devout souls who will believe, as Dr. Lynn Harold Hough has said, that "the freedom of the Christian man is the great matter in religion," and others, equally earnest and devout, who will claim that "the corporate life of the church is the thing of essential significance." The unity of the church must be, indeed, no vague and passive generality, but a positive, substantial reality of belief and urgency and commitment, historical, universal, spiritually apostolic; yet it must be related to these several historic confessions of faith and polity as the body of which they are the living members.

This clearly presents no easy accommodation of things that do not matter to minds which are only casually concerned. It involves, in fact, the fundamental enterprise of society, that of preserving the rights of the individual while safeguarding the claims of the group; and this in the region of the mind and spirit, as well as of the social action issuing therefrom. If the history of religious and ecclesiastical developments has anything to say, it is that this is the most delicate and difficult of readjustments.

But, on the other hand, any intelligent view of present-day life will remind us that we have already made large progress in this direction. Our Christian churches are not united; but our Christians, for the most part, are. The readiness, enthusiasm and effectiveness with which the members of practically all Protestant bodies co-operate in city-wide movements of evangelism or special worship; the constancy with which they maintain common interests of philanthropy and reform, regardless of denominational attachments, or the church affiliation of their leaderships; the ease with which they pass out of one communion and into another upon the presentation of their credentials of membership; the close-knit personal friendships of both laymen and clergy which ramify into all denominations, and are so familiar as to escape notice—all testify to a body of experience and range of interest from which division has disappeared. Unity, in the great unanimity to which we are looking, does not yet exist; but there is a unity already here which cannot be ignored.

It is easy to be cynical at this point, and to say that these instances of co-operation and fellowship which have been introduced as evidences of Christian unity are really proofs of Christian shallowness: signs of the tragic lightness with which the modern church membership sits toward the ancient verities which once elicited the frenzy of persecution and the fervor of martyrdom. It is quite easy to suggest that the tolerance which characterizes present-day Christians is due to the fact that they have no profound religious convictions over which to be intolerant, and to explain the readiness of men and women to transfer from one confession to another by saying that they have not taken their church membership anywhere with seriousness, and have accepted whatever confession they claim, without intelligent understanding. There may even be some ground for such an explanation, as there may, perhaps, be some reason for the charge that the clergy of today are sometimes more

eager for an increase in their church membership than they are jealous for its character.

But all such cynicisms, whatever measure of truth may be in them, overlook the fact that time, and our common enterprise of living together, have bequeathed to us the total contribution of the distinctive churches. Each church has been affected by the influences of all, and the entire group of churches has received some modifying contribution from each. As a result, the individual Christian, by reason of his various contacts, social relationships and co-operative activities, inherits, in spite of his exclusive church membership, the congenial and constructive elements of practical religion which denominations, not his own, foster and exhibit. One has not looked below the merest surface of modern society who has not seen that the fraternity which marks present day Protestantism in its local relationships results from the fact that Christians of today are more clearly apprehending and more constantly practicing their higher loyalties to a common Christ and a common Kingdom which is His purpose. This is a unity already existing, and which must not be ignored; and the question which has now to be faced is as to how this unity can be made effective; because, as it becomes increasingly effective, it will become increasingly apparent.

This necessity presses the more inescapably upon us because of the Church's catholicity. The demand which Chinese Christians will make in the near future, and which American Christianity must meet with honesty and humility, and should be able to meet with pride, will be for a genuinely Chinese Church. It is only a matter of time when the same insistence from India and Africa and Malaysia will command our assent. These distant believers may trace their Christian origins to Methodist or Lutheran or Baptist or Presbyterian or Episcopal or Congregational missions; but they will be primarily none of these. They will be Chinese or Indian or Malaysian Christians; and the unity of the Church must offer room enough for them to be happily at home and productively

active, regardless of their distinctive origins and trends of faith, and regardless of what new qualities and insights they may be constrained to bring out of their own ancient culture or strange but characteristic racial inheritance.

It is for others than I to develop the outline of that body of belief around which the unity of the Church may ultimately be gathered. It must be true to the Gospel and not alien from modern knowledge; and it must be ample enough to include men out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples, speaking in their own tongues the mighty works of God. That body of belief, not yet consolidated, will take shape from the slowly merging substance of the historic creeds and the creative insight of lengthening experience, as devout intelligence reinterprets the eternal values of the creeds in terms of the ever enlarging life of men. That body of belief, it goes without saying, has not yet been formulated. But the Churches may begin the practical demonstration of the unity which already exists, by unifying their impact upon society through their local administration and organizations.

The churches, in a word, will become unified in character and fact, not first, by adopting a common creed, if that shall ever be possible, but by consciously acknowledging and practically executing the common purpose which already their members feel. That purpose is not theological or sacramental; though both theology and sacramentalism have their authentic and permanent function. As the directive minds of the Church, from generation to generation have defined it, that purpose is immensely practical. "It is not as a governing body, as a society of perfection," wrote Dante, six centuries ago, "that the Church will regenerate human nature, but as a brotherhood."² "The Church," said Dr. Fosdick, six years ago, "is primarily an instrument in God's hands to bring

² *De Monarchia*, quoted by Stubbs: *The Christ of English Poetry*, p. 90.

personal and social righteousness upon the earth."³ A socially minded theologian in Chicago has declared that the Church "must bring society and God together;"⁴ and a religious journalist in London, a few years ago wrote that "its business is to create an atmosphere."⁵ The Church exhibits its brotherhood, it is effective as an instrument of personal and social righteousness, it brings society and God together, it creates its atmosphere, not in its great councils, conferences, synods, and assemblies; not in its official functions and institutions; but through its local organizations administered for the common social good, and by their agencies of religious instruction and worship. It is the administration of the local organizations and their agencies of instruction and worship which can be unified in a common purpose, creating a common atmosphere, sustaining a common ideal, fostering a common, though varied richness of personal experience and practical brotherhood; at the same time providing, for the individual, freedom of theological loyalty and security in the historic tradition in which by inheritance or choice he is at home.

It is a fact of too great significance to be disregarded, that by such unifying of local church organizations and administration, we shall be recovering something of the mind and practice of primitive Christianity. After Pentecost, as the Book of Acts makes clear, the Gospel message and experience was widely disseminated through the preaching of the Twelve, and of the apostles and prophets whom the Christian societies recognized, St. Paul, of course, being pre-eminent among them. These societies, informal at first, such as composed "the church in thy house," as St. Paul wrote to Philemon, under the pressure of necessity soon developed a simple but increasingly stable organization, with officials specially designate for the exercise of particular ministeries to the

3 *Christianity and Progress*, p. 44.

4 Mathews: *The Church and the Changing Order*, p. 111.

5 Brierly: *The Common Life*, p. 284.

societies and certain authority over them. But from the beginning they considered themselves, as indeed they actually were, local organizations of the one Church, of which, as Christians, they were individually members before ever a local organization had been suggested.

The Christian Church was not formed by the co-ordination of many local churches into one general body. In the conviction of the primitive Christians, the Christian Church was the gift of Christ to the world; and they were members of it and servants of it, without distinction, whether they were associated together in larger groups in great cities like Jerusalem and Corinth and Ephesus, or in small companies as in Derbe and Lystra and other nameless towns, or whether they lived solitary and obscure among pagan populations. What is more to the purpose, the several societies established in the great centers of population were themselves not distinct and exclusive organizations. They were different groups of the one Christian Church, separately conducted for effectiveness in the ministry of worship, evangelism and charity, and for the discipline of life. Local distinctions and even variations in form and manner might easily prevail; but there was "one body and one Spirit, even as they were called in one hope of their calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all;" and an appeal to their enemies will reveal that they made one impact and one impression upon their contemporary world. It was the impact and impression made by the unity of the local churches: "See how these Christians love one another."

While, therefore, we are exploring the areas of our theological and ecclesiastical differences, while we are collating our unrealized agreements, in search of an adequate and commanding unity of faith and confession, can we not begin to realize the practical unity which needs only to be courageously accepted and wisely directed in order to become apparent? What is necessary is simply that we shall make official and authoritative that which is now commonly agreeable and generally practiced, but

which is unsupported by the vigor of an inescapable and common decision. The Protestant churches of any community might create a governing body with jurisdiction over social action, but having no relation to, or interest in, forms of worship or faith or denominational policy. They might entrust to this body, of their own creation, full responsibility for determining their action in respect of all challenges of public or social wrong, all opportunities for concerted movement in matters of reform, evangelism, and philanthropy, all occasions where wisdom and rectitude might seem to dictate the duty of rebuking, informing or commending officers of government, or leaders of political opinion. That there would never be, in such a representative body, complete unanimity, would not affect the value or validity of its decisions, or the effectiveness of its influence. There are few governing bodies in local churches—Presbyteries, Vestries, or Official Boards—which operate only by unanimous vote. For the most part, we are content to have a pronounced working majority. Nor does the failure of unanimity in such decisions affect the loyalty or deflect the support, except in unusual instances, of those whose sympathies lie with the minority. When its officers decide, the local church conducts its own affairs as an undivided body; and the exceptions which prove the rule are considered discreditable, not to the majority which proceeds to the task, but to the seceders who put individual or party views above the convictions of the group, arrived at by democratic processes.

Such an alignment of local churches would accomplish completely the practical results at which our present-day federations aim, but which they can never accomplish. It would leave every traditional preference of belief and polity untouched, while it concentrated the social and spiritual influences of all the churches and their members upon the particular ends to be achieved. It would require no change in the nomenclature of the churches, yet would give full and compelling value to the name of Protestantism. The general public, in such a commun-

ity, would speak of the Protestant Church as a unity, no longer obscured by its visible divisions. The basal unity of all Protestants and their institutions would be paramount and the differences which heretofore have bulked large and forbidding, would be felt as only incidental to their supreme interests and no longer modifying the great fact of their oneness in Christ. The voice of such a Protestantism in any community, would no longer be a series of disassociated utterances, dying ineptly away upon the winds of secularity or unheard amid the pre-occupations of profit, vulgarity and insolent assumptions of supercilious knowledge. When such a Protestantism should speak to its community, out of eminent and very humble pulpits alike, it would be heard in the deeper regions of public conscience and personal responsibility, not as a negligible exhortation in interest to the few, but as the admonition of Him whose voice is as the sound of many waters. When such a Protestantism should accomplish in its community some reform of morals, some victory of law, some high achievement in philanthropy, it would not suggest the superiority of the service clubs. Men would realize the truth which they overlook today, that social improvement can be maintained only through the illumination of ideals born in the shadow of the Church's altars, and made possible only by the devotion of men and women whom the Church has disciplined in desire and insight and moral purpose. The volume of benevolence which enriches common life today would be seen, in such a community, as no simple product of social pride but as a current of that divine river, which waters all generousities, the streams whereof make glad the city of God. In such a Protestantism, the denominations might still be real and identified; but it would be apparent that, however substantial and significant they were in themselves, their separateness was nevertheless absorbed in the larger and victorious unity of the one Church of which Christ is the head, the directing Spirit, the transforming energy, the redeeming fulness that filleth all and in all.

It is a very familiar imagery which will illustrate this effective unity of local organization and administration: the imagery of the battle-field. Men who were associated, for any length of time, with the troops in France, soon learned that the soldiers thought almost wholly in terms of the Division to which they belonged. They seldom met men of any other division, except on leave of absence or in passing; and their pride was in their Division, their loyalty to it, seemed to be their most commanding emotion. It was by their Divisions, for the most part, that they entered upon the great battles which wrote their names in history.

Had there been an observer able to survey the entire field at the beginning of the Meuse-Argonne battle he would have seen the troops there, going in by Divisions. On the end was the 77th Division, from New York City; small men, mostly, with hundreds of them speaking English with a foreign accent. They had come out of all walks of civil life; from tailor shops on the East Side; from the river front; from the department stores and offices. Beside them was the 28th Division, all Pennsylvanians, with an unusual proportion of men from the universities of the state. Next to them with the 35th, from Kansas and Missouri; stalwart figures of such fine physique as to attract attention wherever they appeared. Beside them was the 91st, from the Pacific Coast; with some men in it from the cities, but with them, for the most part, were the rugged product of the ranches, the mountains and the lumber camps. On their right was the 37th, from Ohio; and next to them the 79th, recruited from Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia, both sides of Mason's and Dixon's line being represented in their outfits. Next to them was the 4th Division, a body of regulars recruited from everywhere on the continent; and next to them the 80th Division, made up of mountaineers from the Blue Ridge; while on the right, the end of the line was held by the 33rd Division, from Illinois. From time to time, of

of course, other Divisions and units were thrown in to relieve those battered and worn by the pressure of the fight. But all of them entered the engagement, thinking of themselves in terms of their own Divisions; bound together by mutual associations and sentiments that gathered around their own home states; each man wearing on his arm his own Division badge; and claiming for his Division superiority over all others in courage, effectiveness and leadership.

But as they fought their way through the forest there, as they climbed those hills of flame, as they crawled through cruel entanglements, as they faced and fell before machine gun fire, as they swept through the last entrenched and fortified defense that made the most formidable battle line in history, it was with no less loyalty to their several Divisions that they found themselves one in a single victorious army. Those soldiers of the South, with their tradition of an historic separation and a fostered romance; those men of the West, with their impatience of an East they did not understand; the Easterners, from colleges and tenements alike; the sons of alien born whose ancestral homes were to be found from the Carpathians to the Pyrenees, and even in Germany itself—on the battle field laid by a hundred differences, and gathered all their diversities of memory and mannerism and pride into one great affection for, one great devotion to, a common commander, a common flag, a common cause.

That way their victory was wrought; and it is in that direction the Churches must ultimately and may immediately begin to move. Whether their doctrinal homelands are among the hills of Calvinism and the Covenants, or in the Methodist fen country of Lincolnshire, or the moors of the Parliament and the coasts of the Mayflower peopled; whether they have been recruited from thriving Baptist towns or peaceful Quaker valleys; while they cherish their distinctive memories and take pride in their particular Divisions, they are already one

in the militant enterprise of Christ, and in the conflict for the victory of His Kingdom. This unity, in which freedom of belief, historic loyalties, and pride in a distinctive past, are unimpaired, while all the energies of a personal religion and practical righteousness are concentrated in a common effort, now exists. It is the unity in which diversity is safeguarded; the unity of the body of which we are severally members; and it needs but to be made effective by authentic and wise direction to become apparent in impact, authority, and sustaining power.

THE MINISTRY AND THE SACRAMENTS

(IV)

GEORGE W. RICHARDS

LANCASTER, PA.

I shall define, as concisely as I can, the views of the ministry and the sacraments in the typical churches of Christ—the Catholic, Orthodox and Roman; the Protestant Episcopalian, Reformed, Lutheran, Congregational, and Quaker. I shall base my definitions upon the doctrinal standards of these churches and upon utterances of their men of recognized authority. The purpose of this assembly requires, however, that we shall consider not only the differences of the Churches in faith and order but to find and consider, also, the points of agreement. Perchance we may cherish the hope that, in the course of centuries since the original differences arose, there have been factors and forces at work in the minds and hearts of officers and members of the Churches which have modified their views to a sufficient extent to warrant a reconsideration of the whole issue. Now that the heated controversies of three and four centuries ago, when distinctions were rigidly drawn and defined, have died down, it is reasonable to hope that a conference on faith and order may result, to say the least, in a better understanding of one another and perhaps in a closer relation of the Churches bearing the name of Christ.

I

THE MINISTRY

First, let us review the various theories of the ministry. Each Church, in one way or another, has a ministry with specific functions to perform. Each Church,

also, recognizes the ministry as instituted by God through Christ and his spirit.

The hierarchy of the Orthodox Church is said to originate "from Jesus Christ himself and from the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles."¹ By the Fathers of Trent we are told that "the priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Savior."²

The Westminster Confession says: "Unto this Catholic visible Church Christ hath given the ministry."³ The Savoy Declaration, 1658, speaks of "the officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church."⁴ John Robinson, an Independent, says: "The Lord Jesus hath given to his Church a presbytery or college of elders."⁵ In the Confession of the Society of Friends (1675) we read: "By the strength and power (of this gift or light of God) every true minister of the gospel is ordained, prepared, and supplied in the work of the ministry." Barclay (Apology) says: "He who gathers them (the Christians) doth also for the preserving them in a lively, fresh, and powerful condition, raise up and move among them by the inward immediate operation of his own spirit, ministers, and teachers, to instruct, teach, and watch over others."⁶ Thus we see clearly that all Churches, from Oriental Orthodoxy to Quakerism, acknowledge a ministry coming from God through Christ. They differ widely in their conception of the way the ministry is authorized and the functions it has to perform. A certain Richard Bernard, an Anglican of the Puritan kind, wrote in the beginning of the seventeenth century: "The Papists plant the ruling power of Christ in the Pope, the Protestants, i. e., Episcopalians, in the Bishops, the Puritans in the Presbytery, the Barrowists, i. e., Congregationalists, in the body of the congregation, the multitude called the Church."

1 *Longer Catechism, Eastern Church*, Ques. 277.

2 *Conc. Trid. Sess. 22*, cap. I.

3 Chap. 25:III.

4 Schaff, *Creeds*, II, p. 725.

5 Davis, *Life of Robinson*, p. 125.

6 Proud, *Hist. of Penna.*, I, 36, 37.

Broadly speaking, there are three types of ministry: the basis of the first is the episcopate. (The papacy is a contracted form of episcopacy, the Pope being *summus episcopus*). That of the second is the presbyterate; that of the third is the divine gift, "immediately bestowed without human commission or literature."

In the Orthodox Church the ministry, coming by succession from the apostles, is called the "ecclesiastical hierarchy," in which there are three orders: Bishop, Priest, Deacon. The bishop is successor of the apostles, "through the laying on of hands, in the sacrament of orders." The bishop ordains the priests and deacons "to minister sacraments and to feed the flock of Christ." The bishops assembled in ecumenical council, have authority over the whole Church. True, the "chief divisions of the Catholic Church" are said to be "under the Orthodox Patriarchs and the Most Holy Synod" and "the lesser Orthodox provinces and cities" are "under metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops." These offices or synods are not in principle above the episcopate, but they exercise episcopal powers in ways required by varying conditions.

The Roman Catholic Church agrees with the Orthodox Church in acknowledging that the "bishops, who have succeeded to the place of the apostles, belong to the hierarchical order." The bishops "are superior to the priests," "placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God," "administer the sacraments of confirmation and ordain ministers of the Church."⁷ So far the Roman Catholic Church is episcopal. But it goes beyond the episcopate.

For the maintenance of the unity of the episcopate and of the faith of the multitude of believers, the Vatican Council (*sessio quarta*) says, "Christ set the blessed Peter over the rest of the apostles to whom and whose successors, the bishops of Rome, he gave the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God." Thus the episcopate is subordinated to the papacy, which has "full power" "to rule, feed and govern the universal

7 *Longer Catechism E. Ch.*, Ques. 277.

8 Schaff, *Creeds*, II, p. 189-190.

Church," and to which all officers and members must submit "in all matters pertaining to faith and morals and those pertaining to discipline and government."

The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. accept the episcopate as fundamental to the ministry. They agree with the Orthodox Church that there are three orders and that the bishops are the successors of the apostles. They will, also, freely acknowledge the declaration made by the Council of the Vatican: "Bishops, who have been set by the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the apostles, feed and govern, each his own flock as true pastors." They will dissent, however, from the last clause of this declaration: "That this their episcopal authority is really asserted and strengthened and protected by the supreme and universal pastor." In the Preface to the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI (1552) we read: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles tyme there hathe bene these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, Deacons."

In the Churches of the episcopal type, the privilege of ordination to each of the three orders—bishops, priests, deacons—is granted by the bishop or, in the Roman Catholic, by the *summus episcopus*, the pope, and is not dependent, in the words of the Council of Trent, "upon the consent, vocation or authority, whether of the people or of any civil power or magistrate whatsoever." An exception must be made of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A., in which the bishop is chosen by bishops and lay deputies and the candidate for orders is admitted by the bishop and a diocesan committee on which there are lay members. The democratic principle seems to have modified the episcopal system in the United States. Yet it ought to be said that, in the twenty-third of the Thirty-nine Articles, we are told that "those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation."

The authority of the ministry, with its three orders, is not regarded as given by God through the congregation by virtue of the universal priesthood of believers but is bestowed immediately and directly by Christ upon the apostles and their successors, who, in turn, minister by divine right to the people. The Council of Trent denies "that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament or that they are all mutually endowed with equal spiritual power." Authority, accordingly, is mediated, either through the papacy or the episcopate, to the lower orders and to the laity. This is the exercise of divine rule through ecclesiastical monarchy or aristocracy, through pope or bishops, in the theory generally accepted by churches of the episcopal type, though there may be schools or parties in the Anglican or the Protestant Episcopal Church which do not hold this view.

In defining the functions of the ministry, we shall call to our aid the two Latin phrases, *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis*, both of which powers are conferred by ordination and reside in the ministry as a whole. The Roman Catholic, Phillips, wrote near the middle of the last century: "The clergy is the sanctifying, the teaching, and the ruling church. The laity is the church to be sanctified, to be taught, and to be ruled."

The power of jurisdiction has reference to the government of the Church and is usually vested in a distinct office or in a judicatory composed of a number of authorized officers. It comprises the legislative, executive, and judicial functions of the Church, which are exercised according to prescribed legal forms and have for their purpose the actualizing of the ideals of the Church in its members.

The power of orders includes the pastoral functions or the cure of souls by teaching, preaching, administration of sacraments, and Christian discipline.

In the churches of the episcopal order the various powers are divided among the several orders of the ministry and can be exercised only by virtue of ordination. The power of jurisdiction is vested in the episcopate,—in Ro-

man Catholicism in the papacy. The Council of Trent says: "Bishops are placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God and they are superior to the priests." Concessions, however, are made in the Orthodox Church to civil rulers and laymen in Synods; in the Church of England to king and parliament; and in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. to the House of Lay Deputies.

The power of orders is more jealously guarded against lay influence. The orders are conferred by the bishop only and by him as the successor of the apostles. The functions of the three orders are clearly defined and the authority for each order is given by a distinct ordination. In general these functions are "ministering the sacraments and feeding the flock of Christ." The Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church speaks more specifically: "The Deacon serves the sacraments; the Priest hallows the sacraments in dependence on the bishop; the Bishop not only hallows sacraments himself but has power to impart to others by the laying on of his hands the gift of grace to bestow them."

In the papal and episcopal Churches the priestly or sacramental functions are exalted above the prophetic. The Council of Trent says: "Sacrifice and priesthood are by ordinance of God in such a way conjoined as that both existed in every law." Where the blessings of salvation are assumed to be conferred by sacramental ways, that is, where the beginning and nurture of Christian life is effected through sacraments, there the priestly functions of the ministry are magnified in distinction from the prophetic. The difference appears in the names applied to the ministry in the various churches. In Roman Catholicism we find the term *ministerium sancti sacerdoti* or *sacerdotium*. In the I Helvetic Confession (Reformed) the phrase *ministerium verbi* is prominent. In the Augsburg Confession the ministry is described as the ministry of teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments.⁹ It is important to note that in the thirty-third

9 *Ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta.*

of the Thirty-nine Articles, "Of ministering in the Congregation," a man is warned against assuming "the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments before he is lawfully called." The preaching of the word is put first and is followed by "ministering the sacraments." The Episcopal Church has different tendencies within its fold, some exalting the sacraments above the word, others the word above the sacraments. Thus by one group the priestly, and by the other the prophetic, function is exalted.

THE MINISTRY OF THE PRESBYTERATE

The ministry of the Presbyterate consists of Pastors (teachers are classed with pastors),¹⁰ Ruling Elders and Deacons. These offices are prescribed in the New Testament and are, therefore, accepted as an institution of God. The Reformed Churches turned to the Bible not only for the saving faith but also for the divine order of the Church. In this respect they differed from Luther, who did not look to the scriptures for a form of church government. He inferred from the principle of the universal priesthood of believers, "that every Christian congregation had the right to test doctrine, call preachers, install and depose them."¹¹ In theory he was congregational.

The Reformed Churches, like the Episcopal Churches, regard their ministry as a divine ordinance, but they differ from them in finding it wholly in the New Testament, without appeal to apostolic tradition, the consent of councils or of the Fathers. The primary motive of the Calvinistic groups, in doctrine and government, was the maintenance of the sovereignty of God's word in the Church and the exclusion "of doctrines and commandments of men which are contrary to his word or beside it in matters of faith and worship."¹²

10 Calvin, *Institutes* IV, 3:4.

11 *Grund und Ursach aus der Schrift*, 1523.

12 *Form of Government*, Presbyterian Church U. S., p. 350.

In the first admonition of Wheeler and Wilcox¹³ we find the following: "If you would restore the Church to her ancient officers this you must do; instead of an archbishop, you must make equality of ministers; instead of chancellors, archdeacons, officials, commissaries, procurators, summoners, church-wardens and such like you have to plant a lawful and godly eldership. To these three jointly, the ministers, elders, deacons, is the whole government of the church committed." So, also, Thomas Cartwright and Walter Travers, both of whom were original expounders of the presbyterial system.

Robinson of Leyden, so far as the origin of the ministry is concerned, agrees with the First Admonition, saying: "The Lord Jesus hath given to his Church a presbytery or college of elders or bishops . . . for the teaching and governing of the whole flock according to his will; and this the multitude jointly and severally is bound to obey, all and everyone of them."¹⁴

The ministers of the presbyterial Churches "are equal in power and commission."¹⁵ There is a parity of the ministry with a distinction in gifts and functions but not in orders. "Bishops and presbyters were originally the same office."¹⁶ The patriarchs, archbishops, metropolitans, archpresbyters, deacons, and subdeacons are regarded as unauthorized innovations in the Church of later times.

The people have part in the calling and election of a minister—a privilege usually not granted the people in the episcopal system. John Robinson says of the officers of the congregation: their power is given them "mediately by Christ from the Church." Luther, in this respect, was in sympathy with congregationalism. The minister in the Lutheran Church is not the representative of God but the representative of the people, who, for the sake of seemliness and order, does that which every Christian, in virtue of the universal priesthood of believ-

13 Neal, I, 185.

14 Davis, *Life*, p. 125.

15 II *Hel. Conf.*

16 II *Helv. Conf.*

ers, has a right to do. In 1698, however, the General Assembly for the Vindication of the Church of Scotland passed an act "unanimously declaring that they allow no power in the people, but only in the pastors of the church, to appoint or ordain church officers."

The *jus episcopale*, the right of oversight and rule, is vested in the presbyterial Churches in judicatories, composed of elders or presbyters—preaching and ruling—the consistory or session, classis or presbytery, particular Synod, General Synod or Assembly. The Congregational Churches, which in other respects are largely presbyterial, recognize no authority above the congregation, save Jesus Christ the head of the Church. Henry Jacob of London, 1611, says: "Each congregation is an entire and independent body-politic, endued with power immediately under and from Christ."

In regard to the seat of authority in the congregation itself a controversy arose among the Independents in the church at Amsterdam, between two leaders, Francis Johnson and Ainsworth. Johnson placed the right of rule in the eldership alone, Ainsworth in the congregation including the elders. When Johnson refused the communion to the followers of Ainsworth, they withdrew and organized a new congregation.¹⁷ But even when the congregational principle was carried to its logical conclusions, it was considered an ordinance of God through Christ and the apostles.

One of the notable utterances of recent years, relating to the ministry as a divine ordinance, was made by the moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1917, in a closing address: "For the rest, the Church of Scotland stands with all historic and Catholic Christianity on the two broad fundamental principles (a) that the Christian ministry is not a man-made thing, but is the gift to his church of the Ascended Savior; and (b) that it is continued and can be continued only by the rite of ordination ministered in the power of His abiding Presence and His Holy Spirit by men who have been

17 Neal, *History of Puritans*, II, p. 70.

themselves ordained to it." One may doubtless trace a high church and a low church tendency in the presbyterian, as well as in the episcopal, churches.

In the Protestant Churches generally the prophetic functions of the ministry are given the pre-eminence. "The chief duties of the ministry," says the II Helvetic Confession, "are the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments, the care of souls and the maintenance of discipline." These are the functions belonging to the *potestas ordinis* and are assigned to the ministry of all Protestant Churches. According to the Augsburg Confession (Art. V), saving faith is wrought in the individual by "the ministry of teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments." This is in accord with chapter fourteen of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which says: "The grace of saving faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word; by which, also, and by the administration of the sacraments and prayer, it is increased and strengthened."

In these excerpts from the Augsburg Confession and the Westminster Confession we are told how the individual obtains righteousness before God through Christ; that is, through the word of God preached and taught. A similar statement relating to righteousness—*justitia*—follows the Decree and Canons on Justification of the Council of Trent, in the Proem of the Decree on the Sacraments, in which the following is affirmed: "It hath seemed suitable to treat of the most holy Sacraments of the Church through which all true justice (righteousness) either *begins*, or being begun is *increased*, or being lost is *repaired*." Here nothing is said of the ministry of the word. The minister in this view is primarily a priest who is authorized to administer the sacraments; not a prophet of the glad tidings of salvation. Here one touches the main point of difference between the Catholic priesthood and the Protestant ministry, growing out of two distinct conceptions of the way of salvation imparted

by God through Christ to the individual: grace on the one side is infused (*gratia infusa*) through sacramental transaction; on the other side it is proclaimed by preaching and teaching of the gospel and appropriated by faith.

THE MINISTRY OF DIVINE GIFT

From the apostles to the present time, there have been men and women, also, who claimed the right of ministry by immediate divine gift. In the first generation of Christians this was the charismatic ministry, consisting of persons immediately gifted by the Spirit of Christ to preach, teach, prophesy, evangelize, etc. They exercised their gifts without formal call from the congregation or ordination by the apostles or officers of the Church.

Ruling parallel to the charismatic ministry is the regular official ministry; these two were not always at peace, usually in conflict with each other. In times of revival, protest against the official church, and reforms, there was a reaffirmation of the ministry of divine gift, and passages to quote in its support in the New Testament were not lacking. One meets it among the dissenting sects in the Reformation. In its modern and moderate form it is found among the Quakers to-day. Barclay in the Apology concedes that God doth raise up ministers "for the preserving them in a lively, fresh, and powerful condition," but He raises them by the inward operation of His own Spirit and "to such ministers we think the outward ceremony and ordination or laying on of hands is not necessary." The dissenting sects of the sixteenth century often appealed to it.

The functions of the Quaker ministry are briefly and yet very significantly defined in these words of Barclay: "And when they assemble together to wait upon God and to worship and adore Him; then such as the Spirit sets apart for the ministry, by its divine power and influence, opening their mouths and giving them to exhort, reprove and instruct with virtue and power, these are thus ordained."

So far as sacramental and regular official acts are concerned, this form of ministry has little in common with the episcopal or the presbyterial ministry.

DIFFERENCES AND AGREEMENTS

On the surface the differences in the views of the ministry in the Catholic and the Protestant Churches loom large. To the superficial or the dogmatic observer they may appear irreconcilable. For the maintenance of them and the ecclesiastical systems of which they are a part, men once fought and bled and died. They felt that the legitimacy and validity of the Church of Christ was dependent upon one or the other conception of the ministry; for it was an essential element of Christianity. So they wrote it into their doctrines and wrought it into their constitutions.

Now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, the spirit of controversy has died down, and time has had the benign effect of calming and tempering the minds and hearts of men, one may find points of agreement as well as of difference in the various historical views of the ministry. These may be summarized as follows:

- 1 The ministry of each church is an institution or ordinance of God through Christ and his spirit. No church regards it as merely a man-made institution; for one reason or another it is assumed to have divine right.

- 2 The ministry of each church is authorized by Christ and is made effective through his spirit. It is a ministry of Christ to men and for men, for their salvation and eternal welfare.

- 3 The purpose of the ministry of each church is to impart the benefits of Christ to men.

- 4 The ministry of each church, the Quakers in part excepted, is especially authorized to preach and teach the word and to administer the sacraments.

- 5 The ministry of each church is entrusted with either the whole or part of the government and discipline of the church.

6 To the ministry of each church is given leadership in the propagation of the gospel or the missionary activities of the church.

The longer one contemplates these points of agreement, the more he is convinced that there is a unity underlying the diversity of views of the ministry, which, in time, may work a closer relation among the churches.

II

THE SACRAMENTS

We have shown that there is a close relation between the different conceptions of the ministry and of the sacraments. The Council of Trent says: "To the apostles and their successors in the priesthood was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering his body and blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins." The Protestant minister is a minister of the word, proclaiming the gospel *and* administering the sacraments through which means divine grace works saving faith in the hearts of men.

1 There are two outstanding views of the sacraments in general, corresponding to the Catholic and the Protestant conception of salvation. The Orthodox and the Roman Catholic theory of the sacraments is largely the same, and yet there is a significant difference of emphasis, especially in the Eucharist. In the Orthodox view the primary effect of the sacraments is generative, nurturing, healing, and sanctifying, the result of "grace" or "the saving power of God, working mysteriously upon man."¹⁸ Roman Catholicism accepts this view of the sacraments but lays additional stress upon the sacrifice of the Mass which is defined by the Council of Trent as "this divine sacrifice" and in which "that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner who once offered himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross; the holy Synod teaches that this sacrifice is

¹⁸ *Longer Catechism E. Ch.*, Ques. 284.

truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof this is effected, that we obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid."¹⁹ Orthodoxy may not deny the sacrifice of the Mass, but its conception of Christianity as a whole does not give the same place to it as is given it in Roman Catholicism. Yet these differences alone in the two branches of Catholicism would not be a serious barrier to their closer relation.

Among the Protestants there are variations in the interpretation of the sacraments, shading from an inherent sacramental presence and action of some sort upon the recipient to the idea of a mere sign or symbol of something that has been effected by the spirit of God before the sacrament is administered, or is effected by the same spirit during the administration but not through material channels as instruments.

The Quakers dispense with sacramental signs or transactions and yet they do not deny the effect which is regarded by the churches as sacramental. Barclay says: "We enjoy and possess the holy fellowship and communion of the body and blood of Christ; by which our inward man is nourished and fed, which makes us not to dote upon outward *water and bread and wine* in our spiritual things."²⁰

2 In all the Churches—Catholic and Protestant—the primary purpose of the sacraments is to *impart* or to *certify* the blessings of salvation, offered by God through Christ, and variously designated as the "Holy Spirit," "divine grace," "saving faith." The Churches, however, differ in their views of the way this is done. The Orthodox and the Roman Catholic consider the sacraments as the cardinal means of grace. "What is a mystery or Sacrament?" The answer of the Longer Eastern Catechism is: "A mystery or sacrament is a holy act, through which grace or in other words, the saving power of God, works mysteriously upon man."²¹ Seven distinct sacra-

19 *Conc. Trid. Sess. 22, cap. II.*

20 Proud I, p. 35.

21 Ques. 284.

ments are enumerated. The Council of Trent speaks of "the sacraments of the Church, through which all true justice either begins, or being begun, is increased, or being lost is repaired." These statements seem to indicate that the sacraments are the only means of grace. If that is an extreme statement, it is doubtless true that they are so prominent in these two Churches that they overshadow any other means such as the word of God and prayer.

The Augsburg Confession (Lutheran)—and the Thirty-nine Articles (Episcopalian) do not differ materially on this point—asserts that "By the Word of God and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given." (Art. V.) Luther's Smaller Catechism makes it clear that there is a unique presence of the Word of God in the sacrament which gives power to it whenever it is administered with good intentions and received with sincere faith. According to Luther the Sacrament is God's word—*Verbum Visibile*, as Augustine before Luther called it. Or, to use another favorite saying of Augustine, which Luther often repeated, *accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*: the word of God is a sacrament and the sacrament is the word of God. According to the Heidelberg Catechism (Reformed), faith is worked in the heart by the preaching of the gospel and "confirmed" by the use of the holy sacraments. The authors of the Catechism would have shrunk from the term "instruments" as applied to the sacraments in the Augsburg Confession. They limit the generating of faith to the preaching of the gospel and only the confirmation of faith they assign to the sacraments. True, the Augsburg Confession, Article Thirteen, also, uses the phrase "confirm faith," but precedes it with the term "to stir up faith." The latter phrase probably would not have been pleasing to the Palatinate Reformers. The Anabaptists were prone to exclude both the written word and the sacraments as means of grace and put their faith in the immediate impartation of the Spirit, through their own preparation and works, such as penitence, prayer, fasting, etc. The Baptist Confession of Faith (English Baptists,

1679) may be taken as a fair representation of the generally accepted view of Baptists in Great Britain and America. In Article Twenty-seven (Of Baptism and the Lord's Supper) we find the following: "Those two sacraments, namely, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are ordinances of positive, sovereign, and holy institution appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ, the only lawgiver, to be continued in his Church to the end of the world; and to be administered by those only who are rightly qualified, and thereunto called, according to the command of Christ."

The condition for baptism is defined in the next Article (28): "Those which do really profess repentance toward God and faith in, and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance according to our Lord's holy institution and primitive practice." This excludes infants; applies only to adults or believers. The form of administration is "by immersion or dipping of the person in the element of water."

Among the Baptists generally the sacraments are a sign of grace previously given; they are continued because they were instituted by Christ as a permanent ordinance of the church and, therefore, a part of the way of salvation.

3 Of special significance is the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant conception of the idea of grace. In the Catholic sense of the term, grace is a stream of spiritual influence or forces infused into men from the transcendental world by sacramental means. In Latin it is called *gratia infusa* which suggests both its nature and the way of its bestowal. The priest is ordained to have charge of the sacraments, seven in number, and ministers to the soul, in process of justification, the necessary grace from birth to death.

Grace, in the evangelical sense, is the mercy of God revealed through Christ in the forgiveness of sins. To be saved and sanctified by grace is not to receive sacramental substance from above or to be transformed by sacramental action but to be freely forgiven and restored

to divine favor through the mercy of God in Christ. It is the disposition of the Father revealed through his Son to the sinner. When the sinner in faith accepts the divine pardon, he is restored to sonship and is an heir of life eternal. Grace, in this form, can be conveyed only through the preaching of the gospel. Hence Luther says: "Of all Divine Service the greatest and most important portion is the preaching and teaching of the Word of God."... "If God's Word is not preached, it would be better neither to sing, nor to read, nor to assemble together at all." Sacraments are signs and seals of pardoning love; may stir up faith and confirm faith; may symbolize what we have experienced or what we are to experience in the Christian life until its consummation in the heavenly world.

One cannot help but feel that at this point, that is, the views of grace, there are serious difficulties in the way of reconciling Catholicism and Protestantism. Catholics deny that there is a sacramental presence in Protestant services, and Protestants, like their founders, Luther and Calvin, stigmatize the mass as a fearful abomination and hideous idolatry.

AGREEMENTS AND DIFFERENCES

The points of agreement and of difference in the views of the sacraments run parallel with those that we found in the various views of the ministry. The points of agreement may be summarized as follows:

- 1 All the churches regard the sacraments as instituted by God through Christ.

- 2 All the churches relate the sacraments in one way or another to the way of salvation, the impartation or the confirmation of the blessings of salvation and the development of the Christian life.

- 3 All the churches, therefore, consider the sacraments as a part of God's appointed way of saving and sanctifying men. They may not be omitted or neglected without loss or with impunity.

4 All the churches agree that the sacraments are to be administered according to conditions prescribed by God and not devised by men.

The points of difference are as follows:

1 There are seven sacraments in the Catholic Churches; only two in the Protestant Churches. For the Catholics the number of the sacraments is not a matter of indifference. The Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on any one who says there are more or less than seven sacraments. The Protestant confessions accept two on the ground that, according to the New Testament, two only with an outward sign and a divine promise, were instituted by Christ. The Thirty-nine Articles say: "There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of our Lord" (Art. 25). So far as the other five sacraments are concerned this same article says: "Those five commonly called sacraments... are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper." This moderate estimate of the other five sacraments of Catholicism all the Protestant Churches would accept and most of them would use more immoderate language in rejecting them.

2 The Catholic sacraments are assumed to have generating and nurturing efficacy and through them the Christian life is begotten, supported, and, when lost, restored. They are channels of grace in a realistic form. The Protestant sacraments have inherent efficacy only through the word of God which is attached to them and, through the word, "stir up and confirm faith;"²² or "to quicken, strengthen and confirm our faith."²³ The Reformed confessions speak of them as signs and seals of the covenant of grace. The Westminster Confession adds that "there is in every sacrament a spiritual relation

²² *Augsburg Conf.* Art. 13.

²³ *Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. 25.

or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other." The Baptist churches regard them as a symbol merely of grace bestowed through other than sacramental channels.

3 The grace conveyed by the sacraments, according to the Catholics, is given in portions, as it were, and in the form of spiritual influences or forces proceeding from God through Christ in a mystical way. In the Protestant view grace is the pardoning mercy, the providing love, and the illuminating truth of God and it is assured, sealed, confirmed, and symbolized by the sacraments.

4 The Catholics resolve the Eucharist, in the form of the Mass, into a sacrifice—an idea which is repugnant to the Protestants.

5 I have presented the conception of the ministry and the sacraments as these are defined in the doctrinal standards of the Catholic and Protestant Churches. They are their heritage and, theoretically, they are supposed to be true to them to-day. The question, however, may be asked: Do they accept them as they were formulated three or four centuries ago in the heat of controversy and in an age wholly different in its way of thinking and manner of living from our own? Surely, it is not unreasonable to believe that changes or modifications of views have come about imperceptibly and that the churches are warranted in meeting in conference to talk matters over freely and frankly and see if there may not be closer agreement than there was in the sixteenth century and, therefore, a closer relation among them in the future.

Among the modifying forces that have been working for a century, more or less effectually in all the churches, one may enumerate the following:

1 The democratic spirit has changed not alone the political and social but also the religious order in Europe and America. On this point Mr. Herbert Symonds, Vicar of Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, Canada, wrote in the *Constructive Quarterly*, Dec. 1917:

"Ever since the Reformation, Reformed Churches have

tended steadily in the direction of democratic government. This is evident even in the Anglican Church, even in England, but in the United States and in the Dominions of the British Empire, the Anglican Church is a democracy with the elected bishop as the chief executive officer. . . . It is no longer the case that the Anglican communion is governed by bishops. They are the chief executive officers of a constitutional and democratic body." Doctrine and practice of the churches cannot escape the modifying influences of democracy.

2 The historical rather than the dogmatic or institutional approach to the study of Christian origins in New Testament times has enabled men to estimate the value of doctrines and ordinances in a new way. The beginning of things is no longer found in a divine ordinance which is to remain unchanged because once for all ordained of God. Things are now assumed no less divine because they came about by vital forces instead of immediate fiat. The spirit of life in Christ and in his followers works out forms of thought and action in the material that is furnished by heredity and environment.

3 This view of origins enables one to discern the transient and the permanent, the essential and the incidental, the substance and the form in faith and order. The form changes; the spirit abides. When Christianity is established in different lands among people of different genius and civilization, and in ages with different points of view and way of life, the spirit of Christ seeks expression and propagation in forms that are adapted to the people, the land, and the age. The forms will always vary widely; but Christ in spirit is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Thus we are delivered from the bondage of legalism and led into the liberty of the sons of God. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

4 Again, the conception of Christianity as life, mysteriously begotten in men through the word and spirit, is gaining wide acceptance. Dogma and institution are not the beginning but the product of the Christian spirit and life. Dogmas and institutions are static and legal,

but Christianity is dynamic and vital, always reproducing itself in new ways under new conditions.

The ministers and members of the churches cannot escape ideas like these; without knowing it they lose hold of the original meaning of their standards of doctrine and their forms of government, their rites and ordinances. The reasons for the divisions in the Church of Christ are not clear to them and at present have little meaning; they remain divided because they have not come under the irresistible power of Christian leadership which will bring them into closer union.

Perhaps these new tendencies ought to be checked; so some think. Perhaps they ought to be given free rein; so others believe. At any rate, they ought to be clearly stated, frankly discussed, and soberly considered; with courage to be true to the consequences.

This is the only reasonable ground for an ecumenical conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, Switzerland.

THE CHURCH'S COMMON CONFESSION OF FAITH

(V)

WALTER JENKINS HOGUE

YORK, PA.

It is a privilege to participate in a meeting called to consider the matter of Christian unity. The sketch in the booklet indicating the direction of the discussion of "The Church's Common Confession of Faith" suggests that we consider three questions.

Question 1. "Is it requisite to Christian Unity that there should be general agreement in an explicit declaration of the Christian Faith?"

To this I should briefly reply "No!" chiefly because there seems to be somewhat of an emphasis on the word "*explicit*." There is no possibility for the next two hundred years that the Church of Christ in the world will be able to unite on an *explicit declaration*.

Question 2. "Is it admitted that among the historic statements of that Faith the creeds commonly called the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed have such weight that with regard to these forms, at least, it is desirable that the Churches should attempt to reach an agreement?"

I should say that the Apostles' Creed probably could be accepted among all Christians as the one declaration of loyalty in which all could agree. If every church in the world had a great choir and organ, they could with profit sing the Nicene Creed. It seems rather probable, however, that many Christian men and women will never care to use the Nicene Creed in any other way. Historically considered as the result of a theological battle and as the expression of the keen and subtle Greek mind, the Nicene Creed will ever be an interesting historical memorial.

Question 3-a. "Could a united Church agree to accept

the Faith of Christ as taught in Holy Scripture, and handed down in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds?"

Yes, I believe that a united Church, united in loyalty and love, would be able to accept the faith of Christ as taught in the Holy Scriptures and as expressed in the Apostles' Creed.

Question 3-b. "Could a united Church agree to leave the occasions for the use of these creeds to the decisions of local Churches?"

Such a Church, possessing the spirit of love and loyalty, generous to all brethren of the common household of faith, would without a struggle or suspicion leave the occasions for the use of the Apostles' Creed, or indeed of the Nicene Creed if used, altogether to the decision of the local Churches and in doing so would in all probability spread the use of these creeds where force could have no effect.

Question 3-c. "Could a united Church agree to recognise, while firmly adhering to the substance of these Creeds, that the Holy Spirit, leading the Church into all truth, may enable the Church to express the truths of revelation in other forms according to the needs of future times?"

It goes without saying that a united Church such as I have envisaged, would, while adhering to the substance of these creeds, gladly recognise that the spirit quickeneth, where frequently the letter killeth and hence would trust the Holy Spirit to lead the Churches into all the truth. Such a Church would express that truth and experience in the thought forms of reality for each generation and for every race of men.

In giving this general acceptance to the Apostles' Creed and possibly to the Nicene Creed if sung or chanted by the choir and congregation, it may be thought by some that this is done because I am a Presbyterian, belonging to a Church which is sometimes said "to be the straightest sect of the Pharisees" and one of the Churches of Christendom most creedal in its faith.

To this it might be replied that according to our own

Confession of Faith the Presbyterian Church has never believed in the infallibility of any Council or Creed or Church.

"All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as ahelp in both."¹

"The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth to worship God according to his will."²

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his Word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commands out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."³

Hence, if it has held somewhat tenaciously to the Westminster Confession of Faith "as being a form of sound words" and as being in its own judgment a helpful, orderly and reasonable explanation of the truths of the Holy Scriptures, it has nevertheless always been the liberty of members of the Presbyterian faith to look forward to that better day when men who love the Lord shall unite together in the unity of the spirit and loyalty to our Lord, each possessing local autonomy and the opportunity to express in and for itself the experience of the Christian faith.

"The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.

"The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before

1 *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 31-4.

2 *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 25-5.

3 *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 20-2.

under the law) consists of all those, throughout the world, that profess the true religion, and of their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God,⁴ which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus."⁵

First, however, I desire to speak in a larger way concerning the expectation that a general agreement could be made upon the basis of the Apostles' Creed. If anyone examines carefully the Apostles' Creed he will probably note that its terms are very generous, that its words and phrases are comprehensive to a degree, and that the whole Creed is so formulated that, as the Lord's Prayer and the Thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, it leads us into a large liberty, where bitter controversy and the limitations and restrictions of definition and controversy are practically impossible. In other words, if the Church of Christ is ever to have a Common Confession of Faith, it must be just such an expression of the faith of Christianity as is made in the Apostles' Creed.

Here we may observe that the Apostles' Creed offers and indeed invites our own private liberty of poetic interpretation. It is not legalistic, nor does it enter into close definitions.

No one can have investigated this matter without discovering that the more closely we press our definition and rigidly limit every word and idea of our faith, the more assuredly are we restricting the common ground of our faith. To be sure, it may be replied that these studied, refinitive confessions are the fences by which the field of faith have been guarded. It is most unfortunate, however, that men have not realized that a fence serves to keep friends out of the fold as well as to guard our field of faith.

It may be altogether doubted from the history of the last eighteen hundred years whether there can ever be any unity among Christians, if by unity we mean uni-

⁴ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 25-12.

⁵ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 26-2b.

formity of polity and of doctrinal expression, when this doctrinal expression is meticulously defined and re-defined. Unity upon the basis of the Apostles' Creed and the large and generous trust of love and loyalty would not be difficult, and for ourselves we believe that these things would be quite sufficient for the progress and the purity of the Church of Christ in the world. Every Church in such a system would have its own local autonomy and its own practice of worship. If in the State as good citizens we can allow men a generous liberty, why may we not do so within the fold of Christ?

Surely the experience of more than eighteen centuries has been sufficient to prove to even the most sanguine and determined that universal Christianity can never agree upon any statement of faith whether historic or present which is given in a narrow, restricted, studied and defined form.

Christianity has entered once more into the Orient. It has won the allegiance of representatives of every great race and people of the earth. It seems rather an immature or a rather audacious mind which should suppose that all men everywhere could take the Word of God and His revelation to the human spirit and perfectly agree upon the exact definition and verbal expression of this marvelous experience.

If we have any vivid imagination, if we have widely read the history of the peoples of the earth, if we have traveled round the earth, and much more if we have ever resided outside the realm of Christendom among the people of India or China, or Africa, then this matter of which I am speaking will present itself in terms of decided reality.

It will be no mere academic discussion. Here are people with every variety of temperament, with historical backgrounds of development for many thousands of years. Here are a diversity of interests and immemorial race and religious customs.

When we thus consider the age-long conceptions of the peoples of the earth, it well-nigh borders upon insanity,

it certainly is dangerously near ignorant provincialism to suppose that the people of India, China, Persia, Japan, Arabia and Africa, shall altogether agree upon the *ipissima verba* of Christianity and shall heartily endorse not only the faith of Christ, but the very phrases and the definitions, the means and methods of approach and outlook of the European or western mind.

Phillips Brooks in January, 1883, writing from Benares, India, has this to say:

"India has interested me intensely. Its past and present and future are full of suggestion. I long to see Christianity here, not merely for what it will do for India, but for what India will do for it. Here it must find again the lost oriental side of its brain and heart, and be no longer the occidental European religion which it has so strangely become. It must be again the religion of Man, and so the religion for all men. At present the missionary efforts are burdened with Englishism and Americanism, and the country does not feel them much; but they are getting broader, and the larger religious life which I am sure has begun to come at home, must be felt here."

The Apostles' Creed for the very reason that it suggests largeness and catholicity of both mind and spirit is certainly more likely to be agreed upon than any other symbol within the possession of the general Church.

At this point I might say that another feature of the Apostles' Creed which particularly commends it to the general Christian world, east, west, north and south, is that *it has no particular limitations of time*. We can scarcely say of it with any truthfulness that it represents specially the thought of the first, the seventh, the tenth, the fifteenth, the sventeenth, or the nineteenth century or that it is Occidental or Oriental.

If we should suppose hat the Christian Church of 1927 could agree to formulate a new Creed acceptable to all, we could be very sure that such a Creed would probably be rejected by the year 1977. Some would desire a declaration outlawing war; others would insist upon the modern Babittry of entire over-emphasis upon "Service";

yet others would seek a denunciation of the Birth Control League. Any Creed drawn up today must of necessity be the expression of a variety of opinions and clashing judgments and would therefore be such an epitome of the conditions peculiar to our own age that even if we agreed upon it, the future would speedily discard it.

Most of our emphasized ideas are merely time-currents, the expression of the interest and outlook of the present decade. What we really need therefore is a statement of our faith which contains the precious element of timelessness. Any such statement must be cast in terms which are very general and in a style which is poetic. It is for these reasons that we consider the Apostles' Creed as the one symbol of all Christendom which best expresses our unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

In the second place I want to ask this question: why is it that the Church originally was not able to agree upon the Apostles' Creed as the general statement of its faith, while permitting the Church east and west a generous modification or local expression so long as it was true in loyalty to the leading ideas of the Apostles' Creed?

When we seek to answer this question we are perhaps directed to those backgrounds of all Church History and of the history of human life for the last two thousand years. We must recognise that the western European man, of which the American is a part, is a conqueror, a fighter, a domineering and a dominant type of man. He fights to retain his own faith, he also fights to put down the faith of another. He demands submission.

Unfortunately almost the only unity which he has ever known has been the result of force and not a generous League of Loyalty. Perhaps we secured this spirit from the age-long association of Christianity in its formative stages with the Roman Empire. No organization which the world has ever known was more firmly or frankly based upon the authority of the rulers and the submission of those who were ruled.

Probably the key to the understanding of western civilization since the downfall of the Roman Empire is

found in the repeated attempts of some power to exercise autocratic control. This has caused revolts, revolutions, wars of resistance and the rise of nations based upon freedom of local expression. Western civilization will probably perish before it consents to surrender local liberties, so painfully won, in behalf of authoritative uniformity.

The European man demands that his own interpretation shall be accepted, and that it shall be the only and the infallible interpretation. King James at Hampton Court Conference 1604: "I will have none of that; I will have one Doctrine, one Discipline, one Religion, in substance and in ceremony."⁶ So long as this domineering and arrogant spirit continues, what sort of union can we expect on the Apostles' Creed or indeed upon any other Creed?

The early ages of Christianity were ages of force. Men were living under the domination of the Roman Empire. Few men in that Roman world had the least idea of representative government, of the power of loyal local governments, or of the growth and life which can only be found where men are permitted a large measure of liberty to express the truth as they have experienced it. Thus if the Roman Empire persecuted the Christians, the Christians themselves were also ready to persecute one another.

Men did in that day understand the need for unity, the power of a united community. However, they had no perception whatever of the truth that such a unity did not require absolute uniformity and agreement upon every detail of life. The great Councils and Creeds are really the monuments of theological battles fought with all the greater intensity, because both parties to the contest realized that everything was at stake. The defeated were annihilated, their opinions and faith proscribed and unless they made complete surrender to their opponents their lives were in hazard. No toleration or comprehensiveness softened the asperities of divergent view-

6 Fuller's History, Book 10, p. 187.

points. For this reason there are millions of sincere Christians today who could never agree to accept the authority of these Councils and Creeds in any other way than as monuments "of unhappy far-off days and battles long ago."

This general attitude of the Christian church partakes unconsciously of the bitter exclusiveness of the Jewish race and religion. Judaism, Mohammedanism and Christianity are the bitter, dominant, dogmatic and exclusive religions of history. Judaism largely determined this for Mohammedanism and Christianity alike. "There can be only one truth, my truth! You are damned if you do not believe it, and I shall assist God in this damnation!"

Now this is the situation in the large, but it is also the situation in the particular. The early Christian Church possessed a spirit of intolerance. The Medieval Church east and west held it; so does every small branch of the Church. Probably no people are so cocksure that they only "possess the faith once delivered to the saints" and are ready to be martyrs for it as are the small groups founded upon isolated ideas detached from the great body of the faith. Such people have gone off at a tangent and must necessarily defend their secession by an emphasized bitterness of criticism towards others.

Christian unity has to reckon with all this as a primary consideration. Each little fissiparous part sets itself up as the whole and claims infallibility with the same assurance as the pope of Rome. People have very long memories and quite extravagant hopes, nor is this only true of the past.

We have been told since the Versailles Treaty of those shadowy historical empires largely built upon myth and legend. In the Balkan Peninsula and along the borders of eastern Europe you will be told for example by a Bulgarian that in the year 927 Bulgaria controlled all territory from the borders of the Byzantine Empire to the Baltic, from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, from Thessaly and the Carpathians towards Berlin and that their emperor Simeon assumed the style of "Emperor and Auto-

crat of all the Bulgars and Greeks." With a very serious face and glowing eyes, he speaks of the determined ambition of Bulgaria at the present time to secure all that territory back.

The interesting feature of the situation is that every other people in Europe have some such memory. The Pole ardently believes that Poland at the apogee of its glory in 1572 extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and incorporated major portions of Russia, Hungary, Germany and the Balkan Peninsula and furthermore brought within its orbit the policies of western Europe. "Hence," says the Polish patriot, "our land will never be satisfied until she regains her lost prestige and power." Thus for every ten square miles of Europe there are sufficient memories of former rule or glory or influence to start ten World Wars.

So too it is in the Church. Until by some means this spirit of arrogance, of domineering control, of determination that we shall not only believe the truth ourselves, but that no other man shall differ in the least from our interpretation and from our statement of the interpretation—until this spirit can be exorcised by a spirit of love and trust and generous loyalty there can be no hope of union on anything.

From such a survey it might seem that I am hopeless of any expected agreement or anticipated blessing from this Conference on Faith and Order. This does not, however, represent my attitude or my faith. There are numerous and multiplied indications that the world may enter upon another phase if it accepts a different spirit.

I shall give only two illustrations, both of them in the field of world government, to symbolize this new spirit which offers hope for a better realignment of the forces of Christendom.

From some standpoints, the State appears much more Christian than the Church. For example, in the United States, forty-eight sovereign states live side by side in perfect amity and concord. They maintain no standing armies to fight each other. They have no customs

frontiers between them. It may be said that it is a long time between the meetings of the Governor of North Carolina and the Governor of South Carolina, but this is not because they dislike each other. It only seems long!

South, north, east and west are held in bonds of blessed harmony and loyalty. Our States with their several histories, with their essentially different climate and industries and products, together with their variously constituted populations, with their entirely local autonomy and responsibility for government, nevertheless are component parts of a real entity.

In this land, because of liberty and release from pressure German and French, Irish and English, Gentile and Jew live together with exceedingly little friction and with no thought whatever that this great League of Loyalty called the United States shall be broken into petty fragments to gratify ancestral whims.

This entity can only be continued so long as local liberties are truly permitted. If anyone says that this bond was cemented in fierce and ruthless war to the bitter end, we are quite ready to confess it, but still rejoin that as citizens we are living in a far more Christian attitude in the State than we are in the Churches. For today, sixty-five years removed from the conflict of the Civil War, there are Southern Presbyterians and Northern Presbyterians, Southern Methodists and Northern Methodists, and these Churches have no reason for separate existence, save that they are not sufficiently Christian to forget bitter memories.

Or let us take a similar illustration in the British Empire. It is the most widely spread Empire on earth. It has now become a League of Loyalty and not an Empire founded on force. Armies do not today keep down Canada, nor threaten Australia, nor even hold in awe the restless populations of India.

Such a League of Loyalty, based upon thorough-going and complete local autonomy, generously granting wide freedom for varied racial and religious characteristics, nevertheless, in the prolonged pressures and strains of

the world's greatest War proved to be unbreakable. Where an Empire of authority with laws forced upon men finally cracked and crumbled underneath the hammer-blows of war, the free Empire of Great Britain, built upon loyalty and liberty and the expression of varied conditions, customs, and characteristics, was the only Empire that escaped the deluge.

If men as Christians could be as wise in their day and generation as are the children of this world when controlling empires, then instead of acting the eagle and the lion, they might try what gentleness and trust would do. We believe that day is coming. We therefore look hopefully forward to that which surely is the Spirit of God governing the ways of Christian men in the churches.

Why can there not be an amicable League or Union of churches with mutual good-will, loyalty and tolerance, having as its symbol such a general statement as the Apostles' Creed and trustingly permitting each component group to have its own Confession and the forms and interpretations that seem best suited and specially helpful to it? If this is not possible then any union based upon force, or upon absolute identity of Confessional statement or upon uniformity of forms of worship has never been as chimerical as at the present day.

There is however, as I have indicated, through these illustrations of empire, an opportunity for Christians to put their trust in the power of loyalty in a large spirit of comprehension, in the expectation and the loyal conviction that in this way only can we find hope for the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

Christianity is a universal religion. Christ founded it upon the worship of the Father and taught men that they could pray in every place. He sent his disciples to the whole world. Try as they may, men find it extraordinarily difficult to discover narrow, bigoted, domineering and petty exclusiveness in the Lord Jesus.

Furthermore that primary universality of the faith in Christ our Lord found noble expression in a converted Pharisee. If reverently we ask what Paul chiefly dis-

covered in Christ which he had never possessed as a Pharisee can we not say that he came into the large and open spaces where the winds of liberty were freely blowing? He himself said that in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit; there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. The Jerusalem which is above is free which is the mother of us all.

Since this is the essential nature of Christianity, destroying hatreds, mitigating antagonisms and bridging gulfs of division and bringing all men into a blessed unity, may we not trust that such a day even here on this earth may come to the sorely distracted and divided Church of Christ?

Is it really necessary that Christian men, serving a common Lord should feel that never in this life will there be a genuine Communion of Saints and that it is only by looking forward to the final consummation that we can have any hope?

Is that the spirit which constrains us to sing

"O that with yonder sacred throng
We at His feet may fall;
Join in the everlasting song,
And crown Him Lord of all."

Surely the hopeful heart, desirous of fellowship and a cessation of all antagonisms will expect that our Lord shall here on this earth see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.

To such an end in its own degree and measure may this Conference contribute.

AS A LAYMAN SEES IT: THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION

T. B. STORK

GERMANTOWN, PHILADELPHIA

It is no reflection on religion in the great universal sense to note that every race, indeed, every man, makes his own religion. It is necessarily so, for to every race, to every man religion comes according to capacity, commensurate with spiritual condition. Hegel has said: "Religion is not brought into man from the outside but lies hidden in himself, in his reason, in his freedom in fact."¹ If there were not latent in man something to respond to God's appeal, it is hard to see how religion could ever come to be.

The usual fashion of discussing religion as if it were an external something, a science or an art to be taught proceeds from an entirely wrong conception of it. Religion is not so, it is not a something imposed by an external power from without but something developed from within. Under the inspiration and guidance of the great Ruler of the Universe man struggles to find for himself an understanding of the world and of his place and duty in it; and that is religion, the joint work of man and God. This is not to say that religion is a self-manufactured thing, an invention of man any more than his manner of thinking or of perceiving. His religion is to be viewed as the gradual development of his spiritual life just as the growth of his thought is the gradual development of his intellectual life.

From the earliest times we know that man had a religion—it was one of the first things he had—the result of his striving after some understanding of his place and duty in the world. Under the compelling drive of his own spirit together with the inspiration and guidance that

1 Philosophy of Religion, Speir's Translation. Vol. I, p. 165.

is given all men in some measure, many and various religions were evoked, religions suited to the spiritual needs and capacity of their makers. Each race and nation contributed under this inspiration according to its own power and capacity. The East Indian, the Chinese, the Greeks, the Roman all fashioned religions to meet their own especial needs, and upon the part of the best of them there was doubtless an earnest sincere desire to attain the truth and the highest spiritual values that lay in them. Last of all the Israelites gave us first Jehovah with the new declaration: "The Lord our God is one God." It was a God of stern and terrible mien, such as might have been expected of a race with its experience, an experience of cruel slavery, of savage wars, hardships and perils. And then at last from the same race came the tender humane religion of Christ with its abandonment of the tooth for a tooth, and the inculcation of turning the other cheek, of good for evil, a far reaching revolution in the ethical view of life.

In other words God allows and expects man to work out his own salvation under the internal inspiration of his spirit, the inner light of George Fox. Thus have sprung up the many and various religions, all fundamentally alike on the intellectual side in the idea of a supreme overruling Power variously pictured according to the several capacities of each race, but always pivoting on that central notion of a supreme power governing and guiding men, but very different in details of how, when, whither and wherefore; and on the emotional side equally alike fundamentally in the looking for protection and help to be bestowed, often in exchange for worship or some particular service, and in the duty and obligation of man to such Power.

Thus as some wise man has said there is no bad religion; all that we can say is that some religions are more highly developed spiritually than others. Religion, be it said with all reverence, is in a perpetual state of growth, it can no more stand still than the intellectual and social development of man can stand still. To be a living re-

ligion it must keep pace with all the advances made by men socially, intellectually, industrially. A living religion cannot remain passive, inert, frozen into inactivity by set dogmas, creeds, rites and ceremonies.

Thus the growth of Christianity may be traced from the time of the Apostles to the present. The human contributions to Christianity were by no means inconsiderable, as learned critics are fond of reminding us. There were borrowings from other older religions, just as these had borrowed from others still older. "Persia left its mark both in Judaism and Christianity, not to speak of pagan and half Christian sects like Mithraism and Manichaeism."² Mithraism had points of resemblance to Christianity in its inculcation of sacrifice and probation, its teaching that by fasting and penance the soul may reascend to and attain union with God from whose divine nature it had become separated. The sacrifice being always offered by Mithras made this ascent and union possible. But Christianity had its own development within itself. At first faith was borne from tongue to tongue by the voice of living teachers, then formulated into elaborate dogmas, fixed ceremonials, all called for, and derived from the natural craving of man to put his faith into visible shape. The multitude required in those days to be guided by authority. It was a life giving, inspiring religion, the highest the world had known or was capable of. It lived splendidly with its long procession of martyrs and saints. It gave us the Imitation of Christ, the Transfiguration of Raphael, the beautiful hymns of the Church, Augustine, St. Bernard, St. Francis, an endless and shining company. Then it gave us the Inquisition, the burning of Bruno, the imprisonment of Galileo, the persecutions of the 15th and 16th centuries. With rack and stake the Church defended its tenets. Intellectually, and for some races, this particular expression of religion was outgrown, a moribund decaying faith. The discovery of America, the revival of learning, the Copernican Astronomy, these and other like hap-

2 Nilsson's Imperial Rome, p. 230.

penings stimulated new and strange thoughts in the minds of men, and with the mental quickening very naturally there followed a religious quickening, a rebellion against the dogmatic authority of the Church. Spinoza, Bacon, Des Cartes, those giants of the intellectual world, were not to be held by outworn doctrines of the schoolmen and the priests. The dogmas, the splendid ritual that had fostered the faith of millions for centuries no longer satisfied. There was a call for something higher in the spiritual scale. Here and there the signs of the coming evolution began to show themselves, skeptics, critics, a new band of martyrs, Wycliffe (1320), Huss (1369), Bruno (1548), to mention only a few, until finally in the thunder tones of Luther (1483), "The just shall live by faith," the old religion heard its doom so far as the great races were concerned. England, the leading peoples of Germany, France, Holland, and Sweden made the great national step forward, leaving Italy, Spain and other southern nations to hold for the most part and very appropriately the Roman Catholic faith because it still filled all their needs, sustained them spiritually with its warm and rich ceremonial, its authoritative dogmas as the more austere faith of Protestantism could not.

How religion comes into being in every race and how it changes with the intellectual and social changes of the race, how the process by which God acts upon and through man and how man responds to that action may be obscure, but that it is a joint work in which man takes an active and by no means negligible part can easily be seen by what has already been stated and by further consideration of the making of many of the later sects of Protestantism; for be it noted that Protestantism, loosening man's spirit from the bonds of Roman Catholic dogma, laid open a path for many new and valuable developments of religion, as well as some eccentric manifestations of man's free spirit within. Perhaps the body founded by George Fox furnishes the most instructive example on this particular point, both in what it accomplished and what it failed to accomplish. George Fox, a spiritual

Columbus of the religious world, launched forth with no guide save his great doctrine of the "Inner Light." He left behind him many of the old landmarks of the ancient faith; ceremonies, creeds, dogmas, human priestly authority were as if they had never been. It was a splendid conception that man and God were to come face to face with no intermediary machinery of ceremonies or priests. God was speaking directly to man's spirit, man was to answer back to God. That was a great thought that in his own heart man was to find the religion of his need, that in those secret chambers God would reveal himself to the sincere and earnest seeker with no intervention of priest or teacher.

But the history of the group illustrates the truth we discuss: that man's co-operation is necessary to make a religion. Only a few rare, choice spirits were able to rise to the heights of the new doctrine. Many could not answer the demands it made, they were unable to live entirely within their souls, to forego the external help of music, ceremonies, and the authoritative teaching of priests; they craved the external expression of their internal beliefs in creeds. With these spiritual props removed, the average man became spiritually lost, utterly at sea. Doubtless it is the highest spiritual attainment in the religious life so to live that man sees God face to face with no veil of ceremony between, no outward and necessarily imperfect expression of his spiritual condition in external creeds; but the history of the Society of Friends shows how few men are capable of so living.

It is a curious bit of human nature that without the help of forms, ceremonies, creeds, and dogmas most men make little progress in religion. Men need these forms and even in the Society of Friends they insisted on certain forms of dress as the mark and outward symbol of their religious belief. They made a form of the total lack of all form which they inculcated thus out of the very formlessness of their Society, creating a form for themselves, to wit, the form of formlessness.

These various and different reformers springing up

here and there signified the birth throes of a new religion. After the Reformation they began to show themselves in all directions. They were the struggles of men under the impulse of greater knowledge, more keenly developed intellectual perception, perhaps of greater refinements of spiritual character, to build up for themselves a religion better fitted to their new needs.

And so we come to the consideration of our present religious condition. It would seem as if once more we had come to the parting of the ways, to one of those places where the race goes *per saltum* into new and untried regions. In this connection there will occur among others the names of Christian Science, Ethical Culture, Unitarian, all making radical departures from the old creeds but apparently without attaining the spiritual heights of George Fox.

Many of the old doctrines have become impossible to modern thought. The verbal inerrancy of the Bible, for example, cannot for a moment bear the criticism of the thoughtful man, knowing as we must how many hands that volume has passed through, copied again and again by possibly careless or stupid scribes, translated and retranslated. Or who would now contend for the religious value of Canticles, the Jewish love songs that even Luther tried to justify as symbolic of Christ and His Church? For Oriental minds miracles were the attestation of Divine power; they required them, and so perhaps we are to understand Tertullian's *Credo quia impossibile*. He believed because what he saw was, humanly speaking, impossible and therefore it must be divine. Its impossibility was the mark and sign of its divinity.

Just as the bowing at the elevation of the host to the tinkling of a bell and the praying to the saints became to many unsatisfactory spiritually four hundred years ago, so now verbal inerrancy, metaphysically framed theological dogmas, and to some even miracles, become useless outworn machinery of belief that no longer fill the spiritual needs of the man of today. All the agitation, the critical attitude toward religion, even the skept-

ticism regarding certain details of religious observances are signs not of spiritual decay but of spiritual life and vigor, of a struggle toward new and higher spiritual truth. It is an evolution of religion that we are witnessing, not a relapsing into paganism. It is not irreligion but a different religion. The heresies and skepticisms of today are the orthodox beliefs of tomorrow. The new development may be a further and lustier blossoming of the Quaker religion of the inner light, omitting not only dogmas and ceremonies, but even the weekly assemblage of worshippers. The times and conditions which were not ripe for these refinements of religious life then may have now reached the point when they demand them.

The developments we have been discussing are all of the more spiritual sort; a recent book, "The Man Nobody Knows," develops a religion of a very different type. It is a materialistic practical interpretation of Christianity in terms of big business. It is the child, we may conjecture, of luxury, material comforts, the telephone, the motor car, radio, the huge businesses that crowd our modern life. But as an illustration of the human contribution to religion there could not be found an apter example. To cite it may seem to some almost shocking. Thus we are told that Christ is the able cheerful founder of modern business, whose teaching will enable a "cub salesman to get orders for shoe polish," and of "Jesus as wording the best advertisement ever written." It is announced that this is the Christ now being introduced to hundreds of thousands of business men and busy women.

Here indeed is a new religion of efficiency in process of evolution, a truly human reaction to the Divine teaching, modifying and to some minds revolutionizing it.

What reality has the spiritual life of the soul, the great vision of the life to come in comparison with this presentation of Christ as the Divine Manager of a Department Store, the successful salesman of shoe polish, the clever advertiser?

And so when we contemplate the present religious condition, of Protestant faith especially as pictured by the

pessimistically inclined, the desertion of the Church for the golf field, the growing neglect of many religious observances which have been thought almost essential, the indifference to creeds and dogmas, we are not to consider that religion in the great universal sense is disappearing, but only those particular props and aids of religion are being discarded as no longer useful to the spiritual life that is now developing. It is only that religion is undergoing an evolution, taking upon itself a new and, let us trust, a better shape. What ultimate form it may assume we cannot tell, but of this we may be sure that religion will exist and go on, must go on, for, like the air we breathe or the thoughts we think, it is an essential part of man's life. All men are religious in some sense just as it has been said all men are philosophers. That is to say all men require to know for their own satisfaction what they are, where they are going in the vast universe. They cannot escape some sense of obligation to something higher than themselves to which they owe loyalty, duty and affection. Even the atheist and skeptic by their very atheism and skepticism make affirmations about themselves and their relation to the Universe which are in themselves a species of religion in their own unsatisfactory way; for they declare there is no God, that in other words the world is entirely without law, that they themselves are entirely independent, isolated individuals owing no duty to any person or thing and without claims or rights themselves. This is the explication of the denial of the existence of God, perhaps not so formulated by the atheist but necessarily implied if his denial be construed logically. This is a positive religion of a sort, however poor or meagre it may seem; it construes the world and man's place in it after a fashion, which is what any religion attempts.

If it be suggested that possibly with the growth of individualism as fostered by Protestantism, the spiritually highly developed man will himself be his own priest, dispensing with the formal Church, perhaps little could be said to the contrary. A higher degree of spirituality, a

greater development of soul may bring it about that men shall be less dependent on external helps for their spiritual life.

There now arises the difficult and puzzling question of the comparative values of different religions. If, however, we bear in mind that all we have business with, all we really have knowledge of is our own soul, the answer will be obvious: for all religion means at the last the salvation of the soul; a religion that accomplishes this must be a good religion for that soul. And from this it is evident that to pass any judgment on a religion we must first know what the particular religion does for its souls, we must know the condition, the state of soul that results. But of this we can know nothing, we cannot judge souls, we cannot compare them and so we have no means of comparing religions or of judging them. That is not for us: we are not equipped for any such task, nor are we required to do more than attend to the condition of our own souls. What presumption would be involved in an attempt to judge the soul of a Mohammedan, a Hindu, a Greek, a Roman, an Israelite. This is for their Master, not for us. For our own souls we have internal indubitable assurances which we cannot doubt without doubting our own existence, and having these assurances we do of necessity pass judgment on all other religions as less spiritually helpful, or perhaps we should say less suited to our own particular needs. If it were not so we should feel the obligation of adopting them, but this is a purely personal valuation having no external validity or truth.

In this very restricted sense we may consider that a religion which knew not Christ or that now rejects him suffers a great spiritual loss just as possibly devout Roman Catholics think that Protestants suffer loss in failing in devotion to Mary and in prayers to the saints. These are all personal judgments that go no further than the individual soul that makes them, but are for such souls true and indubitable.

Were there any disposition to condemn all other re-

ligions but our own there would arise at once the formidable consideration that for centuries myriads of men lived and lived presumably, at least some of them, decently and honestly according to their light, so that it violates our sense of justice to consign them to eternal punishment as evil doers for lack of the dogmas and creeds, the ceremonials of the Christian religion of which they had no knowledge. To do so would be to condemn Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and even Abraham, Jacob, Job, David, some of the wisest, and we have been taught to believe, the best of mankind.

IS CONTINUED PRESERVATION OF DENOMINATIONAL IDENTITIES JUSTIFIABLE?

L. A. VIGNESS

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

An outstanding characteristic of thought and feeling within ecclesiastical circles in our day is the strong tendency toward larger unifications. There is very general appreciation of the undeniable fact that the divided condition of organized Christianity seriously interferes with its efficiency in its mission to lift mankind to a higher level of existence. The vision of half a dozen small church groups in a small community, each of them in financial poverty, each competing more or less with the others, is offensive to the sense of the broadminded observer. He conjures up the ideal of a union of all these groups into one substantial organization. On this assumption he can see ability to provide an attractive and convenient church building, employ pastoral talent of the highest order, maintain efficient Christian educational facilities for the children, contribute more generously toward the promulgation of the gospel in home and heathen lands, and offer substantial aid to higher Christian education and works of mercy. All of which is more or less seriously crippled by the present divisions and contentions.

The ideal vision of this observer has in our day become the vision of many. Nor can any one argue that it is wrong. On the contrary, no sane man can fail to appreciate the profound desirability of reaching such an ideal condition. Jesus looks forward to such a state. "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are."¹ Such is His prayer. Such should be the longing and prayer of all the saints. And such, indeed, is their prayer.

1 John 17:11.

The vision of such an ideal for the church and the earnest longing for its attainment constitute the motive that produced the organization known as the "World Conference on Faith and Order." This body has for a number of years labored for a "Re-union of Christendom." The church bodies throughout the world are at this time interested in the conference to be held at Lausanne, Switzerland, in August this year under the auspices of this organization. The purpose is to do what can be done to heal the divisions in the ranks of the people of God.

When we realize the high value of such contemplated unification and when we note the wide-spread longing for its attainment, what can be the causes that seem to prevent its realization? Can these causes be in any measure justifiable? Why should not now the different church denominations be willing to give up their separate identities and be incorporated in one large, strong and efficient union? With such advantages in sight is it not a narrow-minded, bigoted, inexcusable policy to cling to the small-group system?

These are fair questions and demand fair consideration and reasonable answers.

More than a half century ago Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth² penned the following words: "The History of Christianity, in common with all genuine history, moves under the influence of two general ideas: the conservative, which desires to secure the present by fidelity to the results of the past; the progressive, which looks out, in hope, to a better future. Reformation is the great harmonizer of the two principles. Corresponding with Conservatism, Reformation and Progress, are three generic types of Christianity; and under these genera all the species are but shades, modifications, or combinations, as hues arise from three primary colors. Conservatism without progress produces the Romish and Greek type of the church. Progress without Conservatism runs into Revolution, Radicalism, and Sectarianism. Reformation

2 Krauth: Cons. Ref., Preface.

is antithetical both to passive persistence in wrong, or passive endurance of it, and to Revolution as a mode of relieving wrong."

Conservatism holds fast the attainments of the past. Progress is ready if need be to let go of some such attainments in order to substitute in their plan some things that are new and deemed to be better.

The principle of conservatism retards or obstructs the process of unification of church bodies. Every denomination has a history within the framework of which is contained a complex of doctrines, of politics, of practices, and of traditions. The conservatism in human nature manifests itself in the general unwillingness to surrender any of the theoretical or practical ideas that have characterized the denomination and its history. So long as every church refuses to give up, or at least relax its hold on, certain features of its own and to accept or at least tolerate certain features of the other bodies it follows as an inevitable consequence that unification is impossible. Such is the situation in fact with which the problem of the reunion of Christendom is confronted at the present time.

It is recognized as a situation to be regretted that the church remains in so many divisions. If conservatism is to any extent an obstruction to the longed-for unification, can we then escape the conclusion that conservatism is to that extent an evil? Would not the progress of the Kingdom be greatly accelerated if this factor in the ongoing of history were either entirely eliminated, or at least in a substantial measure reduced?

The principles that govern the progress of the Christian cause among men arise jointly from the nature of the faith, the nature of man, and the particular type of his thinking in any given age. If we linger to examine the first of these elements, we find ourselves in the realm of creeds, dogmas, doctrines. And we naturally raise the question, to what extent is it necessary to the prosperity of the Kingdom to conserve these elements of the Christian faith? We will attempt to look into the matter.

Christian doctrine is truth unto salvation, revealed in the Holy Scriptures, realized in the experience of sanctified men, individually and collectively, and clarified to the intellect by definition. It is to be noted that the truth involved is that particular kind which is effective in causing men to be transformed from the unregenerate to the regenerate state. It is to be emphasized, also, that this particular kind of truth is not found by researches in the realms of nature, in physics, or in chemistry, or in biology, or in psychology, or in philosophy. No spiritually regenerating power lies in any of these. The specific truth contained in strictly Christian doctrine comes not through nature but through a supernatural revelation. In no other way can it come to man. Again we observe that this truth has accredited itself by its regenerating, emancipating, and saving powers in millions of the best men and women that have sojourned upon this earth in the course of centuries and milleniums. That such a power, at first seen and experienced as mightily active in the individual and in society, and yet not reduced to clearness of conception, should arouse many and variously conflicting views and explanations is only what could be expected. Hence debates and factions and schisms, until the articles of faith were clarified by well-drawn definitions.

The function of Christian doctrine, also called articles of faith with reference to its constituent parts, is to serve as organs by which new spiritual life is initiated, and through which this same life operates, in the souls of men. It is a well-known principle in biology that no life arises except from an antecedent life. What is thus true in the physical world is true also in the world of redemption. The new spiritual life which operates in the true disciple of Christ has arisen from no efforts of his own natural powers, from no study, no thinking, no research, no self-culture of any kind or description whatsoever. This vital principle is created by the omnipotent spirit of God; and the means used by Him in this work is the truth contained in Christian doctrine.

Hence, the function of this doctrine in the process and act of initiating in the soul the new life hid with Christ in God.

But the life that has begun as it were in an embryonic stage is endowed with capacity for growth. Like physical life its law is to grow by nourishment, by exercise, by action. And as in the realm of the body the vital principle grows *pari passu* with the increasing size of the organs through which its operations are carried on, so in the realm of the divine life in the soul the spiritual vitality will grow along with the increasing measure of the doctrinal truth appropriated by the mind. True, there may be increasing knowledge of Christian truth without the presence of true spiritual life, but there cannot be sound growth of the life without growth in knowledge of the truth. It will aid our conception of this truth if we realize that the relation of the spiritual life to Christian doctrine is somewhat analogous to the relation of physical vitality to the digestive system, the heart, the lungs, and other internal organs of the body. Thus is seen the function of Christian doctrine in the continued growth of the new life. And what is thus true in regard to its growth is true in regard also to all its activity in the service of God and man.

Christian doctrine is precious in value. Our teachers in the science of economics inform us that the quality called value is composed essentially of two factors, to wit, utility and cost of production. That doctrine is endowed with utility hardly needs further elucidation than simply a reference to what is said in our discussion of its function. Yet it may not be amiss to recall that utility is also composed of two main factors, to wit, human want and the power to satisfy that want. That there is a profound spiritual want in man needs here but to be mentioned. Let us just recall the cries, the groans, the lamentations, the yearnings in the deep silences. Man's spirit begs piteously for emancipation from the terrible bondage. There is human want. Christian doctrine is the only means through which this want can

be met and satisfied. Clearly, then, it contains the element of utility.

But what can be said of its "cost of production?" Aye, much indeed. In the first place it cost the incarnation, the labors and sorrows, the crucifixion, the infinite agony, and the death of our Savior Jesus Christ. These together with His resurrection and all that they imply constitute the center and essence of Christian doctrine. If no vicarious sacrifice had been made we should have had no saving truth.

When Christ had finished His mission and before He ascended into heaven He made the disciples His ambassadors and witnesses. They labored, suffered, persisted and finally sacrificed their lives as martyrs for the preservation of the revealed truth. After their death succeeding generations of witnessess suffered untold agonies in loyalty to the truth. More or less to all the ages may be applied the description of the author of the eleventh chapter of the letter to the Hebrews.

Cost of production! What else can be named that has such a record of cost? Judged by the incomparable measure of its utility and by the infinite expenditure that its creation and preservation has involved there is not a conceivable item of material or immaterial property in the whole realm of human existence that comes anywhere into the vicinity of Christian doctrine both in the excellence of its intrinsic nature and in the extent of its value.

Christian doctrine is necessary to preserve the church from corruption. "Those men whom God, according to His eternal decree, has granted faith and grace, taken collectively, are called the church." Baier, the author of these words, sees a union, or a communion, of men in whom the Holy Spirit by means of the truth incorporated in the Word of God, has created the new spiritual life. Not all men are members of this invisible union. Those only who are possessed with the particular features wrought by the Spirit of God are participants in its privileges. These members are joined together "by the bond of a common faith, a common hope, and reciprocal love." This is the true communion of saints.

But while this is true of the church of Christ in the strict sense, it is true that in the outward organization through which it manifests itself to human observation in the world it includes also many men who lack the living faith which alone makes them members of the communion of saints. This fact, however, is not what determines the character of the church. It "is said to be holy, from I Cor. 14:33; Rev. 11:2; because Christ, its Head is holy, Hebr. 7:26, who makes the church partaker of His holiness, John 17:19; because it is called by a holy calling and separated from the world, 2 Tim. 1:9; because the Word of God, committed to it, is holy, Rom. 3:2; because the Holy Ghost in this assembly sanctifies believers by applying to them, through faith, Christ's holiness, working inner renewal and holiness in their hearts, and awakening in them the desire of perfect holiness."³ All of which is included in the conception of Christian doctrine. From this it follows that by this doctrine and by it alone as it is permitted to exert its influence in its purity is the sound life and sanctity of the church preserved.

It would lead us too far afield to undertake a survey of those experiences in history which show how corruption in doctrine has invariably led to corruption in life and practice in the church. What has been brought to our attention is sufficient to remind us of the utmost importance of purity of doctrine in the matter of saving the church from religious and moral degeneracy.

Christian doctrine, like gold, is easily squandered and lost. It has been said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It must with equal truth be said that eternal vigilance is the price which the people of God must pay for preservation of revealed truth. It seems strange that such a statement should be required. It would seem natural to think that any item of such exceptional value would command the utmost care and guardianship of men. The fact, however, which history amply shows, is that the church is always afflicted with a tendency to

3 Gerhard, in Schmid: *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 588.

gravitate away from sound doctrine. Do we ask why such is the case? Then may we say that in the first place revealed truth lies in a region in which the evidence available in that of the senses and of reason no longer fully operates. Men have found so many illusions and delusions and falsehoods and frauds that they are inclined to demand proof by adequate evidence before they accept any proposition as true. But those truths which come not by the natural way of human observation and reasoning but by divine revelation are not amenable to the kind of evidence that is available in the region of scientific and mathematical thinking. This fact creates in the world of thought an atmosphere that is unfavorable to the maintenance of Christian doctrine; yet, indeed, to a large extent even hostile and fatal to the continuance of doctrinal loyalty.

But the antagonism that comes from the non-Christian thinking of the world presents not the only, nor even the most serious, peril to revealed truth. It is not difficult to see that the environment which affects the senses, and the relations which affect the reason of men ordinarily press upon their consciousness with far greater vividness than do those things which are invisible, eternal and in the heavens. Physical hunger and thirst are by the majority felt more keenly than the desire for salvation in a time far off. To provide covering against the cold of the winter storm seems more urgent than to exercise care for the fine linen which is the righteousness of the saints.⁴ Under the operation of these and kindred propensities in human nature it is easy to see how readily the truth unto salvation may sink into a subordinate position, may lose its vital contents and shrivel into erroneous forms.

To these considerations may be added lists of various motives that induce men to come forward and proclaim new discoveries, show how this or that article of faith must be understood in a different way, and thus endeavor to gain followers and supporters for causes of their own.

4 Rev. 19:8.

There is, practically speaking, no end to all the varieties of floating ideas in that group of people to whom Christ applied the appellation, false prophets.

When we consider all these forces and circumstances we can readily see how easy it is for individuals and the church by inattention and carelessness to squander the riches that God has given His church in the body of Christian truth. And our theoretical conclusion is abundantly confirmed by practical observation and experience.

Christian doctrine is the primary factor in the complex cause which determines the character of the church. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he! The forms of a man's conceptions and the combinations of these forms make out his views of existence within himself and in the environment that encompasses him. These views determine his attitude toward things and the course of action which he follows. His course of action, in turn, is only the outward revelation of his inner spirit, in other words, of his character.

What is true of the individual man is true in this respect also of the church. By way of example, let us recall the doctrine that the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God. Then it follows that the church "is bound to yield to them implicit faith and obedience."⁵ It requires no extended discussion to remind the reader that obedience is a central factor in character, whether it be that of an individual or that of an association, or communion. A person, for example, who obeys his own impulses to falsehoods, or to stealing, or to banditry, or to other forms of wrong-doing, is a bad character. The same holds true of gangs, or groups, or societies. The first question is, What laws, what authorities, what standards, does the individual, or the group, observe?

The obedience which the church yields toward the Word of God implies its loyalty and devotion to Christ as its Redeemer and Savior, its consecration to His service in holy living and in labor for the advancement of His Kingdom. It implies the acceptance of His message in

5 Schmid: op. cit. p. 50.

the sense which His words indicate, whether or not the matter set forth is amenable to the axioms of our natural reason. Thus the true church will not undertake to turn the Word of God into allegories and more or less interesting symbols and myths. "Divine truth is the end of the church; it is also the means. She lives for it; and she lives by it."⁶ And this moulds and determines its character.

Christian doctrine, as historically held, confessed, and defended by the church, has been attained under the divinely promised guidance of the Holy Spirit. Before Jesus left His disciples He gave them many parting exhortations and promises. Among these one assured them that when He, the spirit of truth, is come He shall guide you into all the truth.⁷ This promise was in an initial manner fulfilled on the day of pentecost. But the work of the spirit did not end on that day. Nor did the guiding spirit of God leave the church at the end of the apostolic age. Quite the contrary. His guidance was actively present in the church in all its early struggles with Judaism, with paganism, with gnosticism, with Arianism, with Pelagianism and with other mighty and insidious errors. The guiding and sustaining power of the spirit in the faith and loyalty of the contenders for the Christian doctrines as they met persecution, torture, exile, death, is the miracle of that period of human history—a miracle not explained by all the rhetoric and speculation of so smooth a historian as the learned Edward Gibbon. Christian truth is also in this sense a precious divine gift to the church.

After this survey of some of the features of divine truth, we have no difficulty in saying that in its attitude toward it the church is under solemn obligation to be decidedly conservative.

We have possibly lingered too long to meditate upon the various features of the Christian articles of faith. If, however, we take pains to sum up their meaning to the

6 Krauth: Cons. Ref., p. 183.

7 John 16:13.

life and mission of the church and look at them in the light of the question at the head of this paper, we are brought face to face with the questions, How far should the church to go in its doctrinal conservatism? How far should it refuse doctrinal concessions at the sacrifice of larger unifications? How far should it set aside the opportunity of larger unifications in order rigidly to observe its doctrinal position?

In attempting an answer, which is not altogether a simple matter, we may, as a theoretical proposition, shape it somewhat thus: Visualize the complex of Christian truth as a series of articulated items so arranged that it begins with those absolutely indispensable to spiritual life and continues with the others in downward grading in importance until it ends with one of less fundamental importance. Next, visualize the attitude of conservatism as applied to this series. Conceived as parallel to, and articulated like, the doctrinal series, it should in each of its parts maintain a degree of strength answering to the degree of importance in the corresponding doctrinal article, always keeping in mind the words of Christ, Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.⁸ A deviation even from what seems a very unimportant article, though it does not exclude from heaven, yet leaves its injurious influence. Such are the words of our Master.

True, this is very theoretical. Possibly it may not be very helpful in actual practice. And yet it sets up a general ideal in a practical problem where it is admittedly difficult to lay down any definite rule.

But does further unification among Lutheran synods involve, on the part of any, such sacrifice of doctrinal loyalty as to justify opposition to such unions?

There are no doubt synods that would have no serious difficulty in attaining full agreement in regard to the doctrinal foundation. Indeed, there are synods now which have already reached this stage in their efforts at closer

8 Matt. 5:19.

affiliations. But it still remains as a factor to be reckoned with that the synods are made up, in many cases, of people of different national origins who do not understand each other's language, that each synod has its traditional *modus vivendi* and *modus agendi*, that in case of union they and their membership do leave something behind, and, as it were, immigrate into another environment. In such a migration there is always developed a danger of relaxing the hold upon some of the things hitherto held in possession.

But with all this there should in all such cases be steady effort made toward ultimate unification. Let it not be forgotten, however, that time is an important factor. The doctrine of the "melting pot" is misleading and mischievous. It is applicable to metals but not to organic beings. Mr. Burbank never threw his plants into a pot over a fire to make new variations. He wrought wonderful modification in plant life, but he had to observe the time element. So also in effecting unions of synods. Throw them, as it were, into a melting pot for quick action—you are likely to find them wrecked. Work it gradually, observing the laws of biology, which are applicable largely also in the life of social organisms, and in proper time finer results may be attained.

We conclude that it is the duty of every Lutheran synod to look hopefully forward to one consolidated Lutheran church in America, to make every effort to prepare for such a happy consummation, but, withal, to make progress with careful discretion and loyal Lutheran conservatism. Thus, to the question with which we started we derive the answer, that continued preservation of denominational identities is justifiable to the extent of avoiding hurried and premature unifications and of effecting the unifications only in discrete observance of all the laws of organic growth.

THE LUTHERAN FREE CHURCH

ANDREAS HELLAND

AUGSBURG SEMINARY

The Lutheran Free Church is a religious movement, organized to further the ideals for which it stands and the activities which in the course of events have become dependent upon it for moral and financial support.

The organization of the Lutheran Free Church took place in the year 1897. Over four hundred congregations are affiliated with it. The total membership is about 50,000. There are, however, not a few sympathizers and supporters to be found in congregations not otherwise connected with the movement. These individuals constitute a very valuable asset.

The Lutheran Free Church supports three schools: Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota, of which further mention will be made later; Oak Grove Lutheran Ladies' Seminary, Fargo, North Dakota, founded in the year 1906 as an academy for girls, but last year changed into a co-educational institution; and Willmar Lutheran Bible School, Willmar, Minnesota, organized in 1920. It carries on home mission activity in the United States and Canada, aiding small and weak congregations, and organizing new work. It also carries on foreign mission work in the island of Madagascar and in Honan, China. Finally, the Lutheran Free Church supports a Seaman's Mission in Seattle, Washington, an Orphans' Home and an Old People's Home near Willmar, Minnesota, and similar institutions in Poulsbo, Washington. The Norwegian Lutheran Deaconess Home and Hospital in Minneapolis, Minnesota, is also closely connected with it.

Last year's total income for the support of these different activities amounted to about \$140,000.00.

The total number of pastors serving congregations is 143; evangelists and secretaries of religious activities 11;

professors 15; foreign missionaries 15; emeriti 18; making a total of 202.

Having given these few items of statistical information, it will be the aim of this article to present a brief survey of the Lutheran Free Church viewed as a religious movement, and to point out the underlying historical reasons for its being.

The immediate cause of the organization of the Lutheran Free Church in 1897 was a serious disagreement in the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America which culminated in 1893. But viewed as a religious movement the causes must be sought in the general development of Lutheranism in Norway and among Norwegian immigrants in this country during the nineteenth century.

The Lutheran Church of Norway is a State Church. Up to twenty years ago all of its ministers were educated in the State University; they were State officials, appointed and paid by the State. Such conditions naturally create a feeling among the common people that the pastor is something apart from them, and this again makes it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain that feeling of confidence so necessary in the relation between pastor and congregation. This difficulty is further increased by the fact that the congregations in a State Church are not voluntary associations but purely geographical units of the country.

At the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century Norway was swept by one of the most remarkable religious awakenings in history. The instrument used by God was a young layman, Hans Nielsen Hauge. In the short space of eight years he traveled from one end of the country to the other, preaching repentance, and thousands were converted and became true followers of Christ.

The movement was as genuinely Lutheran as it was truly Christian. Although those who were converted are often called "The Friends of Hauge," it should be clearly understood that Hauge formed no sect, no church

of his own. In fact, his followers were very faithful attendants of church services, even when denounced and persecuted by rationalistic pastors and over-zealous police officers.

It is also important to note that there had been religious movements in Norway before Hauge's days. Most of these had come from without, as for instance the Quakers and the Moravians. But while followers of these movements were scattered here and there throughout the country, they lived very quietly and exerted no great influence on their surroundings. In many cases they looked upon themselves as the last survivors of better days and conditions, suspicious of and suspected by their neighbors, only waiting for their "day of departure."

Hauge endeavored to come into closer contact with these people wherever he found them. In a large number of cases the result was the kindling of a new fire in their hearts, and a spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding which has been of immeasurable value for the Christian life in Norway.

Still another observation must be made in order to make plain the movement which we are here to sketch.

The chief reason for the remarkable soundness of faith which characterized Hauge and his friends, and has characterized Christian men and women in Norway throughout the nineteenth century, may to a large extent be attributed to the Lutheran *Barnelærdom* of that country.

There is no word in the English language which adequately expresses the idea of the Norwegian word *Barnelærdom*. Catechism is often used, but it is easily misleading, since its sense is too narrow. The word connotes child teaching, or child instruction, but has come to stand for a certain set of books of religious instruction, and their contents. These books are: (1) Luther's Small Catechism, (2) a short Bible History, and (3) an Explanation of the Small Catechism. These three books, together with the hymn book of the church, have been the chief sources of the religious instruction of children

in Norway for over a century, and are called the *Barnelærdom*. The explanation most used in Hauge's days and for a long time afterwards was that prepared by the great Pietist bishop Eric Pontoppidan, the title of which is "Truth Unto Piety." During the nineteenth century several other explanations of the Catechism have been published, notably that of provost H. U. Sverdrup. They have all more or less been built upon Pontoppidan.

A faithful, even though not always very spiritual, instruction of the children in the fundamentals of Christianity, based upon these books, has had a wonderful effect upon the growing generations in Norway in giving them a true and simple, yet comprehensive knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, and in cases innumerable it has become a "truth unto piety," as was the case with Hauge himself.

In the middle of the nineteenth century another religious movement took place, which bears the name of a learned and pious professor of theology, Gisle Johnson. This was primarily a revival among the pastors and theological students. It was a wonderful movement, but it can hardly be said that the results measured up to the beginning. For the pastors and the Christian people were not able to "find each other," nor to co-operate in a truly Biblical way.

Many of the younger theologians saw this and tried to remedy it, but in most cases they failed. The fault was not wholly theirs, nor is it to be sought entirely with the lay people. The very system of the State Church made true congregational life exceedingly difficult, if not entirely impossible.

In the year 1825 began the great emigration movement from Norway to the United States of America. It was not long before thousands of peasants, as well as a few city dwellers crossed the ocean every year. Not a few of them were Christians, and almost all of them had a longing to hear the Word of God and to have their children instructed in the *Barnelærdom*. This desire was

one of the blessed fruits of the instruction which they themselves had received as children. These people felt very keenly the need of pastors, and many an appeal was sent back to the mother country. On account of its very nature, the State Church can not do mission work in a foreign land, but several young theologians heeded the appeals and came over to take up pastoral work among their countrymen. These men did a great work, although in many cases it was marked and marred by State Church ideals. Not a few of them became very closely associated with the Missouri Synod, a circumstance which made true co-operation with the Christian laity of their own people still more difficult.

During the period between 1860 and 1880 several young theologians of a somewhat different stamp also came over from Norway to serve as pastors and teachers among their people in this country. They were disciples of Gisle Johnson, imbued with his spirit of religious fervor, but they were also deeply interested in the liberation of the Church from the State. To them a living and free congregation was the great ideal. We shall in the following pages make a closer acquaintance with two of them, Seven Oftedal and Georg Sverdrup, a son of H. U. Sverdrup, the author of the Explanation of the Small Catechism.

Among the Lutheran church bodies organized in this country about the middle of last century was also the Scandinavian Augustana Synod. As the name signifies, this synod ministered to immigrants from all the three Scandinavian countries, although the Swedish element was by far the strongest. But while the brethren dwelt together in peace, still the difference in language and traditions made co-operation in one body rather difficult, and it was agreed that the Norwegian-Danish section should be permitted to withdraw from the school, the Augustana Seminary at Paxton, Illinois, as well as from the synod. As a consequence of this friendly division, Augsburg Seminary was founded in 1869 and located at

Marshall, Wisconsin, and the Norwegian-Danish Conference was organized in 1870. The Seminary was moved to its present site in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in 1872.

Augsburg Seminary is the oldest divinity school in America founded by Lutherans of Norwegian descent. It had a very small beginning. There was a three-year theological course and a one-year preparatory course. August Weenaas was the only regular professor. He was a graduate of the University of Norway, and a man of almost superhuman endurance and capacity for work. He was assisted by another teacher in the preparatory class.

But the friends and supporters of this little institution had a vision of a larger school with increased usefulness, and they cast about for more teachers. But they desired "men of the people," men who would live their spiritual lives with the congregations. They had come away from the State Church, and they did not wish the spirit of that Church planted in the free soil of America.

In God's wonderful way of guiding the course of His Kingdom the desires of Christian men and women on this side of the ocean met the longings of three eminently well trained young men on the other side, and so it came to pass that Sven Oftedal became theological professor in Augsburg Seminary in 1873, and Sven Rud Gunnerson and Georg Sverdrup in 1874. Already in the fall of the latter year these men, together with Professor Weenaas organized not only a fairly complete curriculum of theological studies, but also decided upon a complete college course as a preparation for the study of theology. Naturally, not all the college classes were started that same year, but in 1879 the first class could be graduated. A one-year preparatory course led up to the college.

Professor Weenass returned to Norway in 1876, and Professor Gunnerson in 1883. Professor Sverdrup continued the work until his death in 1907, serving as president continuously from 1876. Professor Oftedal resigned in 1904, but kept in close contact with the institution until his death in 1911. He even served as presi-

dent from 1907 to 1911, although not engaging in teaching work.

As will be seen from these dates, Professors Sverdrup and Oftedal worked in Augsburg Seminary for nearly forty years. And they not only worked there, they were the leaders of the school, and in a large measure also of the church body which supported it.

The central idea in the lives and work of these two men may be summarized in two phrases often used, namely: "A living and free congregation," and "A pastoral training adapted to the Christian congregation." As will be observed, the congregation is the central idea, and the congregation is the communion of saints, the body of Jesus Christ in every place where it is found. It is admitted that the congregation in its outward form is not pure in the sense that it does not contain hypocrites and such who are not truly God's children; but, on the other hand, it is also maintained that we have no right to be contented with this state of things. The confession and program of the Apostle Paul must also be that of the Christian congregation: "Not that I have already obtained, nor am already made perfect; but I press on—."

It is a part of the very nature of the congregation to be free. But freedom is not license. There is no true liberty apart from a corresponding consciousness of responsibility. This liberty is a freedom for ecclesiastical forms, customs and ideas inherited from the State Church which tend to hinder the congregation in the full use and performance of its God-given rights and responsibilities. But that is not all, for true Christian liberty is fundamentally freedom from the bondage of sin, and willingness and opportunity to act in a manner pleasing to God and in conformity with his will. For this reason the congregation can not be truly free, except the Son of God make it free. Consequently there is no freedom, except there be life, spiritual life born of true faith in Jesus Christ. Only in so far as the congregation is a living congregation, is it a free congregation. For freedom is the fruit, not the root of life.

It follows, then, that the preaching of the Word becomes a thing of the greatest importance for the life of the congregation. Therefore the insistent demand that the training of the pastors must be *menighetsmæssig*, i. e., that it must be a training adapted to the Christian congregation. To train just such men is the sacred calling of the divinity school.

Professors Oftedal and Sverdrup, both rightfully deserving to be called learned men, were strongly opposed to a preaching replete with philosophical expressions and difficult and involved theological formulas. They stoutly maintained that the Norwegian immigrants had brought with them to this country no greater and more precious inheritance than their Lutheran *Barnelærdom*. The teaching and preaching should conform to this spiritual treasure. When this is the case, then will the Christian men and women recognize the voice as that of a good shepherd; when it is not, they will keep aloof, for it will be to them the voice of a stranger.

Nor were these men blind to the sad fact that there were many divisions and much uncharitable rivalry in the church life of their people. They recognized as some of the greatest causes of this unfortunate situation the lack of true spiritual life in the congregations, and the lack of understanding and confidence between the clergy and the lay people. The Hauge movement in Norway had clearly shown that there is no more potent agency for the unification of religious factions than a renewed spiritual life. Oftedal and Sverdrup recognized this same agency as the only one which had in it the promise of real success. They advocated life, in order that there might be unity, rather than unity in order that there might be life, just as they advocated life in order that there might be liberty, rather than liberty in order that there might be life.

Along the lines indicated above the Professors Sverdrup and Oftedal built up Augsburg Seminary as a divinity school; along these lines they organized the work

of training Christian ministers for the Lutheran Church. These fundamental ideas also form the historical background of the Lutheran Free Church. Without them, it would not have come into being.

As has been stated above, Augsburg Seminary was the divinity school of the Norwegian-Danish Conference. But the pastors of this synod were by no means unanimous in their adherence to its principles. A reaction had formed, generally called "The Old School"; while most of the younger pastors, disciples of Sverdrup and Oftedal, were called "The New School." This latter faction gained in strength from year to year, until about 1885 they had become a decided majority.

About this time an intense work was begun for church union, with the result that in 1890 the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America was organized. The Conference became part of the new body, and Augsburg Seminary was to be its divinity school. It became evident that there were certain legal obstacles in the way of transferring the school property to the United Church. But more serious than these obstacles was the growing impression that the leaders of the new church body were not in sympathy with the religious and ecclesiastical views of Augsburg Seminary.

There developed an ever increasing lack of confidence, with the result that in 1893 Augsburg Seminary found itself thrown back on the interest and support of its old friends who now formed a minority in the United Church. After several attempts at reconciliation it became increasingly evident that these friends would have to shoulder the burden of supporting the school alone, at least for the time being.

But not only Augsburg Seminary had to be supported by these congregations and individuals who at this time became known as "The Friends of Augsburg." The school and what it stood for had sympathizers among the workers in the foreign field, as well as in the home mission field. On the other hand, the Friends of Augsburg were interested in these and other branches of church

work, and as a natural consequence they soon found themselves face to face with the necessity of taking up active mission work at home and abroad, and of supporting work already commenced. Partly in order to decide about these activities, and partly in order to be of mutual help and encouragement, they held annual meetings in which every man and woman who was a voting member in good standing in a Lutheran congregation was accorded the right to speak and to vote.

However, the hope of reconciliation between the majority and minority in the United Church was not abandoned, and continued attempts were made with this end in view. But the breach only became deeper as the years went by, and at the annual convention of the Friends of Augsburg in 1896 a committee was appointed to draft some sort of program with the necessary rules for work. It was clearly stated in the mandate of this committee, that the aim was not to organize a new synod, but to find ways and means for a more effective co-operation between the congregations and the individuals constituting the Friends of Augsburg. This committee drafted a program, etc., which was adopted by the Friends of Augsburg at their annual convention in Minneapolis in June, 1897. *The Lutheran Free Church* was chosen as the name of the organization. The program was in two parts, the first containing a number of "Leading Principles," the second a set of "Rules for Work."

Before touching upon some of the most vital points in the program adopted in 1897, it is necessary to state that one of the chief causes of the disruption in the United Church was the ever increasing power which this church body was exerting over the local congregations through its officers and annual conventions. On account of a representative system, used to its utmost, it appeared impossible for any minority, however large and well defined, to exert any influence upon the policies of the synod. Every attempt at reconciliation had stranded against a solid majority. Even lawfully elected delegates from congregations had been denied a seat in the annual convention by this same majority.

In the midst of all this strife there broke out a religious awakening which has had no equal in the Norwegian Lutheran Church in this country up to the present time. It was a wonderful time of visitation from the Lord. In human judgment the time would seem most inopportune. There was bitterness and even hatred in many a heart. There was every reason to fear that even the disciples would "fall asleep for sorrow." One can not point to any individual as the cause of the awakening. It came as a spontaneous combustion, spiritually speaking. The whole situation reminds one of the words of John to Peter, as recorded in John 21:7, "It is the Lord!" But while there was no outstanding human *primus motor*, the Lord raised up several faithful leaders of the movement, one of the foremost among whom was the late Reverend Peter Nilsen. He was not what one would call a revivalist, but a wonderful guide for those who had been awakened. When he opened up the Scriptures, many a heart became burning, and many a soul came to see the vision of a sanctified life, a life in fellowship with Christ through the Holy Spirit. The trend of his testimony could very aptly be expressed in the words of the Apostle Paul: "But I speak in regard of Christ and of His Church."

While this spiritual awakening in almost every instance was remarkably sound and deep, there was another religious current pressing in from without, which may be termed as being of the Perfectionist order, although the popular name given to it was "Free—Free." Believing themselves perfect in the sense that they were without sin, these people had nothing but scorn and contempt for the existing local congregations and their pastors. They were ever present to call to the newly converted and not as yet spiritually established souls: "Come out of Babel!"—thereby meaning the local congregation. Since these disturbances would take place just where the religious awakening had taken a hold, it was natural to make the mistake in judgment of regarding them as proofs that the awakening itself was unsound.

From what has been stated above, it will be seen that the very life principle of the religious and ecclesiastical views represented by Augsburg Seminary and its friends was being threatened and undermined from two opposite directions.

It was in the midst of such difficulties that the Leading Principles of the Lutheran Free Church were formulated, and the very first of them went directly to the root of the whole matter by declaring that "The congregation is, according to the Word of God, the right form of the Kingdom of God on earth." By this declaration the Lutheran Free Church at once took its stand between the tendency of the strongly organized church synod to exert undue power over the local congregation on the one hand, and on the other hand, the irresponsible, self-satisfied and disrupting perfectionist tendency which threatened all true Christian unity. It is this same double danger which is guarded against in the third and fifth Principles, when it is stated on the one hand that "the congregation needs, according to the New Testament, an external organization," and on the other hand that "the congregation governs its own affairs under the authority of the Word of God and His spirit, and acknowledges no other ecclesiastical authority or government as a higher tribunal."

Principle number two maintains that "the congregation consists of believers, who by using the means of grace and the spiritual gifts as directed in the Word of God, seek their own eternal salvation and that of their fellowmen." Principle number four, on the other hand, states that "as not all members belonging to the external organization of the congregation always are believers, and as such hypocrites often falsely seek consolation in the external relation with the congregation, it is the sacred duty of the congregation to purify itself by a quickening preaching of the Word of God, by earnest exhortation and admonition, and by exclusion of manifest and perverse sinners."

The remaining Principles deal mostly with the neces-

sity and mode of co-operation of the individual congregations, and the necessity of making the widest possible use of the different spiritual gifts which the Lord has bestowed upon His Church.

The Rules for Work first state the name of the organization, and then its aim, which is "to work toward making all Lutheran congregations living and free congregations, so that they, according to their call and their ability may work in spiritual independence and liberty for the cause of the Kingdom of God at home and abroad, through such agencies and institutions as the congregations themselves might determine." The rules then go on to describe the main features in carrying on of the different branches of church activities, and the conduct of the annual convention of the Lutheran Free Church. Only one more point in these rules shall be touched upon here, as it is of a fundamental nature. It is the following: "The right to vote in the meetings of the Lutheran Free Church is possessed by all voting church members who come from the congregations which constitute the Lutheran Free Church. The right to vote is also possessed by voting members of other Lutheran congregations who, by sending in to the Secretary special blanks which they have signed, make known that they acknowledge the Principles and Rules of the Lutheran Free Church and will work for the aim stated in paragraph 2." This rule does away with the so-called representative system, strictly speaking. However, it is greatly desired and constantly urged that the congregations of the Lutheran Free Church should see to it that they are represented in the annual meetings. At the same time, an opportunity is left open for all who are really interested in the work, to have a voice in the meetings.

The actual work of directing the different activities of the Lutheran Free Church, such as schools, home and foreign missions, etc., is done by Boards of Directors and Trustees. In this way both the work and the power are decentralized and divided, and there is room for an intensive work for each activity by men who are deeply interested in the particular task entrusted to them.

The annual conventions are intended not primarily as business meetings, but rather as rallies, as spiritual get-togethers for those who feel themselves united in a common interest for a common cause. There is, however, always a tendency to lose sight of this side of the annual meetings. They are apt to become merely seasons of exhausting work with details, instead of seasons of strengthening for the work which must go on all the time. The result is that they may become a source of weakness instead of a source of strength.

In the seal of the Lutheran Free Church these words are engraved: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Thus it testifies to the fact that there is no true liberty except in fellowship with the Holy Spirit. Liberty apart from the Spirit of the Lord very easily becomes license, which is one of the worst forms of slavery.

Viewed from a materialistic standpoint, the organization of the Lutheran Free Church is weak. It has no strong constitution and no strong central government. There is a wide opportunity for congregations and individuals to misuse their liberty and to shirk their duties, as there is no strong human hand to take them to task and bring them to terms. The Lutheran Free Church is strong only in so far as it gives room for the Word and the Spirit of the Lord to do their work in the hearts of its members. It has its roots in two spiritual awakenings in Norway, and it was born of a spiritual awakening in this country at a time of great distress, at a time when men's hearts were sorely tried.

To work for the ideals brought out through these awakenings is the sacred inheritance of the Lutheran Free Church, and it would seem that this can best be accomplished by a faithful adherence to the ideals of a living and free Christian congregation and a training of pastors adapted thereto. These ideals are both Scriptural and Lutheran. In these ideals also lies the hope of a truly Christian Church Union, as Christ's prayer was that the disciples might all be one in Him and in the Father.

WHAT THE MISSOURI SYNOD STANDS FOR

W. ARNDT

CONCORDIA SEMINARY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

It is with pleasure that I comply with the request of the editor of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for an article on the distinctive beliefs and practices of the Synod to which I belong, the Missouri Synod, hoping that a frank, straightforward declaration on the position of Missouri will help one or the other of the readers of the QUARTERLY better to understand the nature and the aims of this church-body. It may be well to say at the outset that, while Missouri is frequently charged with aloofness, this must not be taken to indicate that it stands all alone, having no associates or allies. It forms a part of the Synodical Conference, in which it is united with the Wisconsin, Norwegian and the Slovak Synods. To mention such an external matter as statistics, the Synodical Conference numbers approximately 835,700 communicants, of whom, according to the latest figures, 675,956 are members of the Missouri Synod.

One prominent feature of the Missouri Synod is strict confessionalism. Friend and foe admit that it stresses loyalty to the Lutheran Confessions. In the eyes of some, its attitude toward the Confessions is commendable; others think it extreme. Missouri's view concerning the Confessions of the Church is very simple. It does not look upon them as inspired or infallible; on the contrary, it admits that they contain errors in exegetical and historical matters. But it maintains that the doctrine which they set forth is throughout that of the Holy Scriptures, and hence must be accepted without curtailment. This has been the position of our Synod from the very start, and this is where we stand to-day. In these days, when men worship so commonly at the altars of science, and progress is one of the great watchwords of

the age, it may seem strange that a number of Lutherans should still look upon their Confessions, drawn up 350 to 400 years ago, as pure and unassailable in the teaching which they exhibit. In explanation of our view, we simply say it is our conviction that the Lutheran Confessions throughout teach not man-made doctrines, but the truths laid down in the Bible. The Confessions have been criticized severely for various reasons. But one charge, we hold, has never been successfully raised and maintained against them, namely, that they deviate from the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. I ought to add that this our view is not an a priori one. It does not rest on the ipse dixi of the Confessions or of some other authority, no matter how constituted. We hold the Confessions in such high regard because we have examined them, compared them with the Scriptures and found that they present the teachings of the infallible Word.

After the above statement nobody will be surprised to learn that Missouri frowns upon all departures from the confessional writings of the Church and refuses to grant them board and lodging in her household. Our church-body does not simply praise the Confessions, but takes them very seriously. They are to us a precious heritage, and we demand of all who wish to be our brethren to share this our view. Missouri for this reason has been called intolerant. It does, indeed, seem inexplicable to many people that a large church-body should in this day and age continue to insist that all the doctrines of a set of confessional writings must be accepted by those who wish to unite with it. We are told that this is a narrowness which is as unpopular as it is disastrous to the cause of Christian union; that it makes impossible the healthy growth and development of the Synod taking such a position; that it creates the impression that Lutherans look upon their Church as the only saving Church; that it produces an orthodoxy which is intellectual, but otherwise dead. Now, about the unpopularity of such a stand there can be no doubt. Here we Missourians are not entertaining any illusions. But we say to ourselves

that
tor v
Pop
than
the
sura
reve
the
ence
writ
Chr
had
form
to c
trin
unio
His
His
pect
caus
W
to fl
very
the
spee
the
Syn
on
sion
men
der
we
ben
to a
firm
role
ism
ing
you

that popularity or its opposite cannot be the deciding factor when the question is asked, What is true in religion? Popularity is of the earth. Infinitely more important than the approval of man must be the endorsement of the great God. To follow His will and to have the assurance that our attitude is in keeping with what He has revealed must be more precious to us than the plaudits of the multitude. The argument that such a strict insistence on all the teachings contained in the confessional writings will make the union of all who call themselves Christians impossible carries little weight. If Christ had given His disciples the commission at all hazards to form a large, well-organized church-body, we might have to concede that our position is untenable and that all doctrinal tests should be discarded where the questions of union with other churches arises. But since He made His disciples merely witnesses, instruments to proclaim His glorious truth, we need not be troubled by the prospect of meeting with scant response to our message. The cause is the Lord's, not ours.

With respect to the prediction that people will refuse to flock to our standards, we say, for one thing, that this very prophecy was uttered when our fathers organized the Missouri Synod on a strictly confessional basis. A speedy dissolution was said to be in store for it. But the very opposite of what was expected happened. The Synod grew by leaps and bounds in spite of its insistence on loyalty to all the doctrines of the Lutheran Confessions, and thus demonstrated the futility of the argument that you have to bow to the whims of the age in order to meet with success in mission endeavors. Besides, we feel that even if our church-body, owing to its unbending attitude concerning the Confessions should fail to attract such numbers as it might gather without this firmness, it will be well worth our while to go on in this role, holding high the torch of unadulterated Lutheranism and counteracting, as much as lies in us, the prevailing indifference concerning matters of doctrine. When your car is traveling down hill, there is not much need of

anybody pushing it, but a brake is what the traveler is anxious to have in such a case. If we cannot do anything else, we should like to act at least as a brake with respect to the rush of the Protestant world into the slough of utter indifferentism. Everything about us indicates that such a service is an urgent necessity.

When the criticism is voiced that such an uncompromising emphasis on the Lutheran Confessions creates the impression that Lutherans look upon their Church as the only saving one, we reply that it is an impression which we must counteract by setting forth in clear terms what our Church teaches in this respect. The Lutheran Confessions certainly do not point to the Lutheran Church as the sole body where salvation can be obtained. They quite clearly express the conviction that there are children of God in erring churches where the Gospel is still preached, even if not in its fulness. By giving clear utterance to this great truth, we may convince our opponents that the Lutheran Church is not so narrow as they believe it to be. But it would be manifestly wrong to become lukewarm in our loyalty to the Confessions because such loyalty might lead to a wrong view of the position of our Church concerning erring bodies. The charge that our insistence on unflinching adherence to the doctrinal contents of the Confessions will produce a dead orthodoxy may at first seem so weighty and well-founded as to make defense of our position quite difficult. To hold certain tenets with the head and not with the heart, to wrangle about points of doctrine while love, which is the fulfilling of the Law, is neglected, to lay more stress on the intellectual acceptance of certain propositions drawn from the Bible than on a living faith in Jesus Christ, how utterly reprehensible and diametrically opposed to true Christianity it all is! It merely has to be mentioned, and its objectionable nature at once is evident. In denunciation of dead orthodoxy we are not willing to yield to any one. But this is the question, Does firmness in the teachings of the Confessions of the Church produce this sad state? This is what has to be

proved, and we maintain that such proof has not been brought thus far. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that loyalty to confessional teachings may well be united with true piety and warm-hearted charity. Paul, the apostle who gave us that matchless song on Christian charity, was by no means given to compromises in matters of doctrine. Luther was firm as adamant in what he conceived to be the truth, and still, if there was a generous, warm-hearted, truly pious and God-fearing man living in that age, it was he. We may here point to the fathers of the Missouri Synod. Sturdy men they were and mighty in debate, unflinching in their defense of Lutheran teachings, but those who knew them well tell us that they were at the same time men of deep piety, kind, loving, zealous in the cause of Christian missions. I may here point to the subject treated by Dr. Walther in the opening sermon when the Synodical Conference was organized in 1872. Basing his remarks on I Tim. 4:16, he formulated his subject thus: "How important it is to make the saving of souls the one great object of our co-operative work in the kingdom of Christ." The sermon is a striking proof of the truly evangelical spirit which actuated the great leader of the Missouri Synod. Hence we may say that history does not bear out the charge that where there is insistence on full acceptance of the teachings of the Confessions dead orthodoxy will reign. That, owing to our sinful human nature, emphasis on a certain truth easily develops into over-emphasis, that the line between firmness on the one hand and fanaticism on the other is but finely drawn, that contenders for what is right have to be on their guard lest they lose their balance and unwittingly become champions of what is wrong, is true enough, but does not in the least justify laxity in matters of faith and morals. We all know from experience that no road is more difficult to travel than the middle one which avoids both extremes of a position, the extreme which demands less than the Word of God, and the extreme which demands more than the Word of God, but that is no rea-

son why we should leave that road. However, the consideration to which we assign first place in arguing the point under discussion, is that the Scriptures urge us to adhere faithfully to the divine truths revealed to us. It is not necessary to quote texts. Now, we Missourians look upon the teachings of the Confessions as divine truths taken from God's Word. In all honesty, we do not see how we, regarding these teachings as we do, could take a different attitude toward them. To count them debatable would mean not merely repudiation of our Confessions, but rejection of the divine Word itself. If that is called narrowness, we cannot help it.

This quite naturally leads me to dwell on the position of the Missouri Synod concerning the Scriptures. Recent discussions have shown that there is no unanimity on this subject in the Lutheran Church in America, although, be it said with gratitude to God, modernistic views concerning the Bible have infested the Lutheran Church in America not nearly in the same degree as is the case in Europe. The Missouri Synod believes that the Scriptures are divinely inspired and inerrant in every detail. Such infallibility, of course, we do not ascribe to the versions, but only to the original documents as they emanated from the hands of the holy writers. That we hold this view of the Bible is due to the declarations of the divine Word itself, especially to the instruction which the Son of God has given on that point. When He says (John 10:35): "The Scripture cannot be broken," making this statement with reference to a single word, we say that He teaches the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures, and when Peter in 2 Pet. 3:16 puts the writings of Paul on a par with the Old Testament Scriptures (cf. the word "other"), he indicates that the New Testament writings are not to be looked upon as inferior to the books of the prophets. It is often charged that those who teach the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures are advocates of a mechanical theory of inspiration. The implication seems to be that one cannot hold the former without at the same time embracing the lat-

ter. I must say that I have never been able to see the justice of this charge. It may be that some defenders of verbal inspiration have used expressions or illustrations which created the impression that a mechanical theory was held. In such case the presentation probably was at fault, but the doctrine itself was not affected. In teaching verbal inspiration, we do not say that the prophets, evangelists and apostles were mere machines when they wrote the books of the Bible. As to the "how" of inspiration, we have no explanation to offer. But that it was a most potent and blissful reality and that it gave to us not merely the thoughts of God but His very words as well, of that we have no doubt. The view held nowadays by many Lutherans, according to which the Bible contains errors and discrepancies in minor matters and is not equally inspired throughout, we cannot endorse, believing firmly that it is at variance with the explicit testimony of the Scriptures as to their own character.

That the Lutheran Church in America, generally speaking, exalts the atonement of Christ and makes it the center of all its teaching, I am glad to put on record as my sincere belief. Hence when I say that the preaching in Missouri Lutheran Churches is Christocentric, I do not wish to imply that in this respect we follow a course different from that of all or some other Lutheran bodies in America.

It is well known that the history of the Missouri Synod is marked by doctrinal controversies. Some of these had to do with the doctrine of grace, treated especially in Articles II and XI of the Formula of Concord. Is it God's grace alone to which we owe our election and conversion, or is there something meritorious in man which induces God to elect and convert and lead to glory those that are saved? Is there any quality or attitude or act on the part of Christians which accounts for it that they have been made believers in Christ while so many others who have likewise heard the Word have not been united with the Lord who bought them? These questions indicate the ground that was fought over. Missouri still pro-

claims and defends the monergism of divine grace, rejecting, however, the Calvinistic tenets of its irresistibility and limited scope. Our position here has been frequently misunderstood, and yet it is so very simple, consisting merely of these two great Scripture truths: (1) conversion and salvation are entirely of God; (2) unbelief and continuance in this state and damnation are entirely of man.

Not long after the middle of the last century the so-called four points (open communion, pulpit fellowship with errorists, Chiliasm, and lodge-membership) became the subject of extended discussion. The conservative section of the American Lutheran Church held that the four things mentioned constituted violations of clear teachings of the Scriptures and were inconsistent with confessional Lutheranism. Missouri is among those that still hold this view. After what has been said above on our attitude concerning the Confessions of the Church, it will readily appear that we could not commune with errorists or exchange pulpits with them without becoming guilty of insincerity. We are often criticized for taking this attitude even toward other Lutherans who do not share our doctrinal position. But certainly the name "Lutheran" cannot decide whether pulpit and altar-fellowship with a certain man or group of men is right. How easy it is to hide behind a name! A little reflection ought to suffice to make everybody see that this criticism is very shallow. Concerning Chiliasm, which happily no longer is much of a factor in American Lutheran church life, we hold that it is condemned by the clear statements of the Scriptures, and can pose as Biblical teaching only where sound principles of interpretation are ignored. Membership in the lodge we consider an evil which has to be combated with great earnestness. In our view, the lodge is an anti-Christian society, professing a form of religion which entirely excludes the heart of the Gospel, the atonement through the blood of Christ, and which is characterized by indifference toward the revealed truths of the Bible. It is our sincere con-

viction that while testifying against membership in secret societies is not likely to make a minister or a congregation popular, it is a service of incalculable value to the cause of true Christianity.

Another characteristic of the Missouri Synod which even a casual observer would hardly fail to notice is the earnestness with which it fosters the Christian training of its children. It maintains two normal schools in which young men and, in the case of one of these two schools, young women are prepared for the noble profession of teacher in a Christian day-school. A high percentage of its congregations have established such schools at great expense to themselves. If the congregation is too small to call a teacher in addition to the pastor, the latter frequently teaches the school. In these Christian day-schools children are instructed every day in the saving truths of the divine Word, and their whole education is put on a Christian basis. Congregations are urged not to limit the religious training of the children to Sunday-schools and to a few months of catechetical instruction prior to confirmation, but to let the children be under the influence of the Gospel every school day. Since not only our own children, but those of strangers as well, if they apply, are enrolled in our Christian day-schools, the latter are quite an important mission agency. As far as other missions are concerned, Missouri's emphasis has been chiefly on home missions in our own country. The last thirty years, however, have seen it establish missions in India and China, South America and Mexico. It is generally recognized that the work among the colored people of our country carried on by the Synodical Conference is worthy of high commendation.

In the foregoing the prominent features of the Missouri Synod, those which would strike an outsider most forcibly, have been presented. Is there anything that can be said concerning our view of the future, our hopes and aspirations? Will in our opinion the American Lutheran Church continue to resemble a camp torn by hostile factions—will it ever be united? For one thing, we

Missourians would like to flood the world with the Gospel. To extend our missions, to preach Christ to ever-increasing numbers, to become more zealous in such efforts, that is our wish and prayer. With respect to the union of all Lutherans in America, I wish to declare our hearty desire to see the present state of warfare ended. We should certainly rather see peace than war prevail in our household, provided that it is a peace consistent with the truth revealed in God's Word. Controversy, it ought to be clear, is better than a peace resulting from indifference, slumber, or stagnation. We are not without hope as we look upon the future. The recent Intersynodical discussions between members of the Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo Synods and members of the Synodical Conference have had good results, even if they have not yet brought about the desired consummation. Not long ago one of the prominent church-papers of the American Lutheran Church voiced the opinion that there ought to be held so-called free conferences, at which the differences between the Lutherans of America are freely discussed. This is exactly our opinion, too. It would be wrong on the one hand, to unite with each other without having looked at and composed in a scriptural way the differences which keep us apart. To take such a course would mean a setting aside of God's Word and the violation of the conscience of many of us. On the other hand, it would be wrong not to endeavor to enlighten each other on the points where one party believes the other to have erred from the truth. In our judgment, that is the direction in which, humanly speaking, lies the path for the American Lutheran Church out of the present condition of discord to one of harmony, unity and union.

THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD

OSCAR N. OLSON

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

To know the present we must know something of the past. So much in form and character of a church body has its roots in nationalistic antecedents that it becomes impossible to understand any church body without some knowledge of its history.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND

The Augustana Synod sprang from that Swedish immigration which started in the early forties of the last century. The type and character of this immigration has greatly changed in the course of years. The early immigrants were mostly farmers, crofters and tenants, driven by economic pressure to the promising plains of America. Later immigrants are mostly mechanics. The pioneers were also generally strongly religious, while later arrivals have been much influenced by modern social doctrines of Europe and show little interest in the church.

The beginnings of the Augustana Synod were naturally determined by prevailing religious conditions in Sweden. These were twofold. The Lutheran church of Sweden was and is a State Church. As such it is part of the accepted scheme of things, regulating life from the cradle to the grave in a perfectly formal way. The pastor and the sheriff are both state officials, equally feared and obeyed. While spiritually minded pastors were indeed found, many were unworthy of the office. In spite, however, of such unworthy pastors the State Church had a tremendous pedagogical influence upon the nation, fostered education, churchliness, and a thorough Lutheran indoctrination, however formalistic it might be. To this

influence we must ascribe the respect Swedes in general have for the Church. Even though not members of the church, they wish to have their children baptized and confirmed in the Lutheran Church and desire to be married and buried by the Lutheran pastor. Nor should we fail to recognize the tremendous influence of a common hymnal and liturgy, used practically unchanged for over a hundred years, to say nothing of the catechism in the schools, devotional books in many homes, and the Bible itself. These things are not cast off in a generation.

But the formalism of the State Church brought about reactions. Genuine revivals arose in many places. Men like P. Fjellstedt, P. A. Ahlberg, P. Wisselgren and later C. O. Rosenius and others exerted a deep influence. They were deeply spiritual and warmly evangelical. It was providential that the pioneers of the Augustana Synod were largely influenced by these revivals and that the early leaders were men who, though trained and ordained as ministers in the State Church and grounded in the Lutheran faith, were in full sympathy with this evangelical movement, this newer pietism. This spirit put its stamp upon the Augustana Synod, especially in its earlier period. This pietism was in some respects narrow and ascetic. This was to be expected in a movement that was largely a reaction against dead formalism. It was no doubt also partly due to the primitive conditions, the isolation and struggles of the pioneer period. But this is clear, that but for this earnest faith and these deep spiritual experiences of the pioneers the Augustana Synod would never have been born.

That there were some undesirable by-products of the spiritual awakening in Sweden during the last century, need not surprise us. A movement known as Erik Jansonism, a species of religious fanaticism, resulted in a colony of religious communism at Bishop Hill, Illinois, but ended in tragedy and failure. Numerous sects found the spiritual soil congenial for proselyting and have continued to the present day. A separatistic movement

gained strength, and under the leadership of P. Waldenström eventually broke loose from the State Church. The main doctrinal contention centered about the vicarious atonement, which was in effect denied by Waldenström, while another difference referred to the nature of the Church and condition for membership. Religious controversy ran high in the seventies and was transferred to the Swedish communities in America, causing many defections from the Lutheran Church. Rival churches were organized and the Swedish Mission Covenant came into being. The bitterness of the early period of the controversy is fast disappearing and the doctrinal differences are seldom stressed and hardly known to the younger generation. Without wishing to pass any judgment on the sincerity of the motives of those who caused this division in the Swedish Church, the propagation of it on this side of the Atlantic has undoubtedly hindered the progress of the Augustana Synod.

DOCTRINAL POSITION

To the general public the name of our synod, *Augustana*, conveys no meaning, since very few know the origin of the name. In this respect the choice is not a happy one. But like the first Augustana (*Confessio Augustana*, 1530), the name carries both an historical and doctrinal implication. The pioneers were at first not inclined to stress doctrine. The first pastor, L. P. Esbjörn, felt no scruples about accepting financial aid from a Congregational home mission society. But their Lutheran consciousness asserted itself and they early sought affiliation with other Lutheran bodies. The connection of the Scandinavian pastors and churches with the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Northern Illinois (Org. 1851) and Dr. Esbjörn's position as professor at the Illinois State University at Springfield, Illinois, from 1858 to 1860 is well-known history. It is also fairly well known that the withdrawal of the Swedish pastors from that early affiliation was in the nature of a protest against neo-Luther-

anism, then prevalent, as well as for the sake of preserving their own independence. It was therefore very appropriate that the name Augustana should be adopted when the Synod in June 1860 was organized. It was on that account also natural that, when the General Council was formed in November 1867, the Augustana synod was one of the constituent bodies. The doctrinal position of the synod is clearly stated in its constitution as being evangelical Lutheran, acknowledging the Holy Scriptures as the inspired Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice, accepting the three ecumenical creeds and also the unaltered Augsburg Confession as a short but correct summary of the chief doctrines of Christianity, understood in harmony with the further exposition of the same as contained in the other confessional writings of the Lutheran Church. From this the synod has never swerved. Defections in doctrine in the Lutheran Church in Europe and American modernism are not disturbing the synod, though it would perhaps be claiming too much to say that it was entirely untouched by these movements as well as the scientific spirit of the age generally.

ORGANIZATION

It might have been expected that since the Swedish Church has the episcopal form of government the Swedish Lutheran immigrants would have adopted this form of organization. But this was never seriously proposed. Even repeated visits of bishop von Schéele and recently a visit by Archbishop Nathan Söderblom of Sweden, has not awakened any desire for the episcopate. This is due partly to the fact that the pioneers harbored no special love for the Swedish Church, partly to Reformed influences, partly to contact with other Lutheran bodies, none of which had the episcopate, and partly to the democratic spirit of America. Besides, while the Swedish Church is episcopal in government, it is Lutheran in doctrine and never placed any doctrinal significance in the Apostolic

succession nor the office of bishop as such. Episcopalian efforts to proselytize among our people, using the episcopate as a bait, have met with small success.

In order of development the Augustana Synod grew out of the congregations as units. These were organized first and quite independently. They exercise a large degree of local control. To this extent the synod is fundamentally congregational. But upon the organization of the synod the congregations became constituent parts of this body and are through a strong constitution bound by its decisions. There is, therefore, a strong centralization which has been steadily augmented, though not always without opposition. Much power is vested in boards, even the theological professors being elected by a board. The thirteen conferences, into which the synod is divided, grew out of the practical necessities of supervision and administration, but have gradually acquired increased jurisdiction until they in some respects resemble district synods. They do not, however, possess the right of ordination and are subject to synodical decisions in all matters not definitely delegated to them. It must be admitted that as the conferences have built up various institutions, and control home mission and other activities within their respective territories, a tendency to sectionalism has developed. The importance of the conferences has greatly increased since the Synod in 1894 changed from a direct to a delegated representation at its conventions.

The Synod meets annually, one pastor and one lay delegate for every 1500 communicant members representing the constituency. The delegates are nominated by the mission districts, smaller units, and elected by the conferences, which also meet annually, the pastors and one layman from each church constituting the voting body. All decisions are mandatory upon the constituent congregations. The Synod has also granted the vote at its meetings to all the professors of the theological seminary, the editors-in-chief of its official papers, and to the various boards of institutions and missions and schools of higher learning.

THE MINISTRY

The strongest centralizing factor in the Synod is undoubtedly the ministry. While the congregations are free to call their ministers without the interference from outside authority, the only restriction being that they must be Lutheran, they have never presumed to *ordain* their own pastors. This is the prerogative of the Synod, which also reserves the right to determine their qualifications. No pastor is ordained except upon a call from a congregation or a mission board and after due preparation and examination. A complete college course and a three years' theological course are the regular requirements for ordination, though exceptions may occur. But while ordained upon a call to a congregation, the pastor is not subject to discipline by the congregation. This is referred to the conferences or ultimately the Synod. The pastors have, therefore, an extra-congregational standing due to synodical ordination which gives them a certain independent position. This is expressed in the constitution of the Synod which, it states, is composed of "pastors and congregations." This conception of the ministry saves the Synod and pastors from the dangers of extreme congregationalism and arbitrary individualism. The need of more concentrated authority in calling pastors, supervision, transfers, discipline, etc., is, however, felt.

WORSHIP

The Swedish liturgy and hymnbook were "bred in the bone" of the immigrants. The stately chorals and the hymns of J. O. Wallin, the "David's harp of the North," were part of the spiritual heritage they brought with them across the waters. That many felt as did the Israelites at the dedication of the second temple, when they attempted to carry out this beautiful, time honored liturgy in their insignificant pioneer churches, without altar or organ, and recalled the venerable churches in Sweden in

which they had worshiped since childhood, even as their fathers from time immemorial, was but natural. But as time went on and more beautiful temples were built, the Swedish order of service found a more fitting setting and in its English form is as dear to the new generation as is the Swedish to the old. A new English hymnal is now introduced. A few churches have adopted the Common Service, where special conditions have prevailed. The Luther gown is coming into general use, likewise the vested choir. There is no "high church" tendency in our Synod, though there is a growing insistence upon dignity and beauty in its music, architecture and forms of worship.

EDUCATION

The Lutheran Church believes in an educated ministry. The first pastors among the Swedish immigrants were mostly university trained men from Sweden. To meet the rapidly growing need for more ministers and provide for their education, an arrangement was entered into with the newly founded Illinois University at Springfield, Ill., and Rev. L. P. Esbjörn became Scandinavian professor. Upon the organization of the Synod in 1860 one of its first concerns was the founding of a theological school, and Augustana College and Theological Seminary was founded the same year. At first intended primarily for the training of ministers, it has gradually developed into a first class modern college with other departments added and with an enrollment of a thousand students. The seminary has five professors and is strictly conservative. Eventually other colleges and schools were started by various conferences, or by private initiative, until there are at present four colleges, and five junior colleges and academies. The Synod is also largely interested in two inter-synodical Lutheran Bible Schools. Higher Christian education has thus continued to be a major interest in the Synod. A vexing question, besides the constantly growing need for financial support, is that of securing

a closer coöperation in management and greater unity in the educational system.

Primary religious education in the Synod did not receive the attention in the beginning that it deserved. Parochial schools were maintained in a few instances in the larger settlements, but with the development of the public schools these gradually died out. Vacation or summer schools were maintained with students as teachers, or in many cases the pastors themselves, but with the passing of the Swedish language, which formed perhaps too large a part of the instruction in these schools, it has become increasingly difficult to keep them up. One reason for this decline is undoubtedly the fact that the Synod never made any attempt officially to systematize these schools and make provision for their support outside of passing "resolutions." They were left to the mercy of the local congregations. Attention has lately been directed to the newer movement of Week Day Religious Education, which the Synod has endorsed. Sunday schools have been generally maintained and are now being better organized. The Synod maintains a general Sunday school secretary and has recently introduced a fairly complete graded system of Sunday school literature.

ORGANIZED ACTIVITIES

Luther League activities are well organized. Summer encampments and Bible conferences are gathering larger groups of young people every summer in various parts of the Synod. Women's Missionary endeavors are represented by a strong Woman's Missionary Society with ramifications in every conference. The brotherhood movement has in recent years received strong impetus and is being organized under a general secretary on a synod-wide scale.

The Augustana Synod has from the beginning been carrying on charitable work. The Immanuel Deaconess Institute at Omaha, founded by Dr. E. A. Fogelström, is

based on the Kaiserswerth model and maintains connection with similar Lutheran institutions elsewhere. An affiliated institution is located at St. Paul, Minnesota. The Bethphage Mission and home for epileptics and feeble-minded, founded by Rev. W. G. K. Dahl and located at Axtell, Nebraska, while not under synodical control, draws its support largely from the Synod. A large number of hospitals, orphanages and homes for the aged, inner mission activities, immigrant and seamen's mission are scattered throughout the Synod and are well supported. A Ministers' Pension and Aid Fund of over a million dollars is in operation. Home Missions has been a primary concern of the Synod from the start. The task has been staggering, extending, as the Synod does, over the entire continent. Canada constitutes at present the greatest mission challenge. At first aiming mainly at the ingathering of the unchurched Swedish Lutherans and using the Swedish language, the field has now widened. It may be humiliating that the Synod has been able to gather within its fold only some 222,000 communicant members, but counteracting factors have made the task difficult. Even as it is, the Augustana Synod is a notable achievement in home missions. In foreign missionary endeavors the Augustana Synod is coöperating with the United Lutheran Church in the India field as it did previously with the General Council; it maintains independent missions in China and Africa and raises an annual budget for foreign missions of over two hundred thousand dollars. The synod's publication work was begun by Dr. T. N. Hasselquist in 1856 with a few fonts of type in his own home in Galesburg, Illinois. Through the Augustana Book Concern the synod is now carrying on an extensive publishing business. In matters of finance the budget system is generally followed. In the local congregations the voluntary weekly pledge system is generally used.

POLICIES AND PROBLEMS

The language question has caused more discussion than local difficulty. The tide toward the use of English has been irresistible; any attempt to hinder it would have been worse than useless. A reluctance to drop the use of Swedish was natural among the Swedish born, but the transition has been rapid, especially since the World War. A somewhat artificial stimulus to keep up the Swedish as the language of the church may be found here and there, notably in the east; but with restricted immigration the number of Swedish immigrants is small and the pioneer days are past. A knowledge of Swedish is still, however, quite desirable for pastors in their pastoral visitations.

In the matter of pulpit and altar fellowship the Augustana Synod adheres to the principles laid down in the Galesburg rules, though exceptions may be found. In matters of civic morals, national and community celebrations or similar occasions our pastors and people are free to participate without implying a compromise of faith. The Synod has thus not only endorsed prohibition but has been officially represented on national and state organizations for its adoption and enforcement.

The Synod is in principle opposed to "oath bound societies with religious ceremonials," particularly masonry, involving a denial of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ and His vicarious atonement. Effort to remove from the constitution the reference to secret societies have failed, but strict enforcement of the rule has seemed impracticable. The Synod has repeatedly condemned card-playing, dancing and the theatre and is constantly barring such amusements from its schools and churches. In regard to marriage and divorce the Synod in 1925 decided that "marriage cannot be annulled or dissolved except by death, adultery or fornication, or malicious and permanent desertion" and that in the case of remarriage of divorced persons this be permitted only to the "inno-

cent party" when divorce has been granted on above named grounds.

The Augustana Synod has been conscious of its special mission in the family of Lutheran church bodies in America, but has not been exclusive. Sharing in the work of the former General Council and later in the National Lutheran Council, the Synod has manifested the same spirit that such early Lutheran leaders as Wrangel showed when the Swedish Lutherans on the Delaware joined hands with H. M. Muhlenberg and the German brethren of the faith in organizing the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1748. Friendly relations are maintained with other Lutheran bodies, and the Augustana Synod has a vision of a federated Lutheran Church of America on a common doctrinal basis.

COÖPERATION AMONG LUTHERANS IN FOREIGN MISSIONS

JOHN ABERLY

GETTYSBURG SEMINARY

Foreign Missions not only invite but also demand co-operation. The field is so vast, the resources so inadequate, that the Christian forces would be unfaithful to their trust if they failed to help one another and seek help from one another whenever and wherever possible. Such coöperation goes beyond denominational bounds. The International Missionary Council has as one of its most serviceable tasks that of making such local as also nation- and continent-wide surveys that it can suggest lines of coöperative effort that shall prevent overlapping and duplicating of agencies and so secure both greater economy and efficiency in the work. Large thought and effort has been given to this phase of mission work and the returns they have been yielding have been most encouraging. Since the Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910, such interdenominational coöperation has in a large part eclipsed denominational coöperation. There are agencies, organizations and budgets to promote the former while the latter is left to individual initiative.

This article is to confine itself to some such unorganized efforts at coöperation among Lutherans that invite the attention of the student of missions.

COÖPERATION AMONG LUTHERANS IN INDIA

India is both the oldest and the largest of mission fields. Among Protestants, Lutherans were the first to enter this field. The old Tranquebar Mission was founded in 1706. It was in a very real sense a coöperative work for it had the support of the Danish Government, of the pietistic movement in Germany, and, to a

limited extent, of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (S. P. C. K.) in Great Britain.

When in 1845 the Danish Possessions in India were turned over to Great Britain, and the mission property of the Tranquebar Mission, which had long since lost its first love, was transferred to the newly-formed Leipzig Missionary Society, this society itself furnished the opportunity for coöperation on a large scale. All Lutherans of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Russia, and, later, the Missouri Synod of America, worked through this Society. One could wish that the ideals of this Society in uniting all Lutherans in a common task might have succeeded. This, however, was not the case. Not only did the Danish Church, the Church of Sweden, and the Missouri Church, one by one, sever their connection and take over their own fields of work, but different provincial and free churches, generally under the inspiration of some great personality, Father Gossner, Louis Harms, Christian Jensen, and Skrefsrud, sought and cultivated their own mission fields. The American Lutheran Church started its own mission in 1842. From 1869 to 1920 General Synod and General Council had their separate missions. Missouri has its own mission since 1895. Ohio has its own since 1914. Each of these missions has its own field of work, is a distinct entity, and perpetuates itself on the foreign field. It is an amazing record of individualism; and yet also a testimony to a unity of faith that can exist apart from external organization, for when Lutherans meet one another in interdenominational Councils and Conferences, they, with almost no exception, stand together.

This being the case, it would seem that they ought to be able to get together in a common organization that can address itself to common tasks. The first definite steps in this direction were taken among the group of missions that labor in the Telugu language area. These were the General Synod Mission with headquarters at Guntur, the General Council Mission with headquarters at Rajahmundry, with the Hermannsburg Mission (now the Joint

Synod of Ohio Mission) to the South, and the Schleswig-Holstein (or Brecklum) Mission to the north. The first Conference of these four missions convened in Guntur, India, Jan. 17, 1895; the second at Rajahmundry, Sept. 24, 1896. From that time on until the All-India Lutheran Conference took its place in 1908, this Conference met very regularly about once in two years. The chief task to which it addressed itself was that of providing Telugu Literature. By it the *Gospel Witness*, the organ of Lutheran Missions in India, was launched. In the vernacular it published the *Christian Teacher*, which, more than any other one venture, helped to provide Christian literature for our Lutheran Missions. It projected a common translation of Luther's Catechism and of the Liturgy. Though made, these were never adopted by the various missions, as their churches were too strongly attached to the versions to which previous training had accustomed them.

It was this Telugu Missions' Conference that made itself responsible to arrange for a Conference of all Lutherans in India. This Conference first met in Guntur in Jan., 1908. It was proposed that it meet once in four years, and so the second Conference was held in Rajahmundry in Jan., 1912. This second Conference was, to my mind, the one that addressed itself most energetically to its task. A plan was drawn up for the federation of Lutheran Missions in India. The Home Boards were addressed to give their approval to this coming together. Proposals were made for a United Lutheran College and special emphasis was laid on the establishment of a United Lutheran Seminary at Madras. This Conference left a hopeful spirit for a United Lutheran Church in India. If only the machinery could have worked faster, it would have been of untold advantage to the Lutheran Church in India when the great War took away from about half the Lutherans in India their missionary leaders on whom the Church was still very largely dependent. Home Boards did, however, approve what had been done. A permanent committee was appointed to call another

Conference to perfect the proposed federation. Then came the War. Had the federation been completed before, I have no doubt it would have been easy for Lutherans to look after their own even then. As it was it took long negotiations before that goal was attained. Of this I hope to write in a separate article in a subsequent number of the *QUARTERLY*. Here let me only follow the further steps towards coöperation.

During the War no steps were taken except such as were unavoidable. Because of the contiguity of the missions, the Church of Sweden Mission and the Danish Mission assisted Leipzig; the General Synod Mission assisted the Hermannsburg and Ohio Missions, and later Gossner; and the General Council Mission assisted Schleswig-Holstein. Coöperation now shifts from India to the Homeland. When Lutheran Boards tried to assist distressed Lutheran Missions, they found it not only highly desirable but absolutely necessary to approach government authorities through some one body that could speak for all the Lutheran Missions. It was this practical necessity that led to the organization of the Conference of Lutheran Foreign Mission Boards in America which rendered effective service in conserving Lutheran Mission work throughout the world.

In India the War drew Lutheran Missions together in a special way. The Church of Sweden cared for the work of the Leipzig Mission but all the other Continental Lutheran Missions were cared for, wholly or in part, by American Lutheran Missions. There was an attitude of mutual interest and dependence that seemed peculiarly favorable for a large advance step in coöperative work. The All-India Lutheran Conference met in this expectant mood, Oct. 4 to 7, 1921. At the second meeting of this Conference in 1912, 81 missionaries and 10 Indians took part; at this, its third meeting, the number was 33 Indians and 25 missionaries. Nearly the whole Conference was given to the consideration of a constitution for a United Lutheran Church in India. But for a sense of chivalry which refused to take final action on such a

union while the missionaries of most of the continental missions were excluded from the deliberations by the exigencies of the War, this plan of union could have been adopted at once. It was with this as a background that it was suggested to the World Conference of Lutherans at Eisenach in 1923 that the Lutherans represented there take the necessary steps to launch such a united Lutheran Church in India. The plan was heard with interest, referred to the Executive Committee, and then allowed to drop as being too far in advance of the times. One wonders however whether here as elsewhere it may not have been the case again that those concerned did not know the day of their visitation. At any rate, at the fourth meeting of the All-India Lutheran Conference held in Madras at the end of 1925 and the beginning of 1926, less adventurous forms of coöperation were considered. They were limited to a United Seminary and to the coöperation of some of the missionaries in the Andhra College. The Joint Synod of Ohio has since decided to support a Professor in that Institution. The Seminary has not yet been begun. As is so often the case in mission work, the Church in the field is ready for coöperation even to the extent of union, but divided interests in the lands supporting the missions stand in the way. It leads to the concluding observation that in practical coöperation the Lutheran Missions in India now are not as far on as they were before the War.

COÖPERATION AMONG LUTHERANS IN CHINA

The work in China is much newer. For that very reason, however, coöperation in practical work was comparatively easier. Another reason for more advanced steps in coöperation is that in central China—in the provinces of Hupeh and Honan—the missions of Scandinavian origin both European and American, have their fields closer together. It is among these that very effective united work has been done.

It was at the centenary of missions in China, at Shang-

hai, in 1907—Morrison having gone to China in 1807—that Lutheran missionaries met to discuss coöperation in mission work. The establishment of a Seminary was the subject that then received most attention. Such a Seminary was founded in Shekow, ten miles northeast of Hankow, in 1913. The Churches coöperating are the Norwegian and Finnish Missionary Societies, the Augustana Synod, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America and the Lutheran Free Church. A united school for the children of missionaries was also established in the same year.

More significant was the organization of the Lutheran Church of China, August 24, 1920, with a common church book and liturgy. Besides the missions that coöperate in the Seminary, the Schleswig-Holstein Mission also joined in this enterprise. In 1923 these missions joined in establishing a Lutheran Home and Agency at Hankow. Such agencies are needed in that land as supplies must be sent from some central place to the stations that are in the interior of China.

It will be noticed that these coöperative efforts had just been fairly launched when the recent disturbances in China began. It is also to be noted that the coöperative enterprises were chiefly in the areas where the greatest disturbances occurred. Much that has been built up will no doubt have to be rebuilt. Whatever the future may have in store, that will not change the fact that of all Lutheran coöperative work in Foreign Missions this was started with greatest promise of success. It is to be hoped that the present disturbance of it may be only temporary and that it may continue on even a larger scale. Because of the great distances and the poor means of transportation in China, it would seem however that any practical coöperation must be limited largely to missions operating in contiguous areas.

COÖPERATION AMONG LUTHERANS IN JAPAN

Lutheran work in Japan is on a smaller scale. Before the merger in the American Lutheran Church, the United

Synod of the South had the largest Lutheran Mission there. The General Council Board coöperated in this work even before the merger in America took place. The United Danish Church, which used to have a separate mission in Japan, has also united its forces with those of the United Lutheran Church there. The Icelandic Synod also supports one of the missionaries in that Mission. The work there is a real object lesson in a specific form of coöperation, not by seeking to coördinate the work of different missions but by having all unite in the support of one mission. If ever the churches in a mission field are to unite in one Church while receiving support from Foreign Boards, it would seem that it would have to be in some such way, the different Boards making their contributions to the general work instead of each carrying on its own work. It is along this line that the Augustana Synod contributes to the support of the Rajahmundry field of the United Lutheran Church's Mission in India. It raises the question, If this can be done in a limited way, could it not be done in all Lutheran mission work? It can be done when the Church in the mission field becomes the body through which mission work is to be done and the various Boards give their quotas to it instead of to their own independent work. Should that time ever come, the chief obstacle of a united Lutheran Church in the various mission lands will have been removed.

OTHER COÖPERATIVE WORK

There are other fields where Lutherans coöperate. As an example, the Church of Sweden and the Leipzig Missions in India each have their own mission fields but the Tamil Lutheran Church in both missions is one and the same Church. So the Norwegian Missions in Madagascar used to be one mission; but since the mission field of the Church in Norway and that of the Norwegian Church in America have been divided, the indigenous Church still continues as one Church. Where churches

were started under one Board it is easy thus to keep the Church one. It does seem however that those who direct foreign missions in the various Lutheran Churches as now constituted would do well to get together and to study the situation and see what ought to be done to build up one Lutheran Church in the various mission fields of the world or at least in the various language areas where the Church is not thus united. This could be secured before the larger union of Lutheran Churches in Christian lands is realized. When once that union is consummated, it will follow as a matter of course that the Church in the mission fields will draw together, just as, only this year, the Lutheran Churches of the Telugu country in India were united in the Andhra Lutheran Church. It is self-evident that every step in coöperation will **make for** greater efficiency in the carrying on of the work of the Church in foreign lands. That there will always be a Lutheran Church in those lands may perhaps be doubted. The strong nationalistic waves sweeping over mission fields may produce national Churches there. But if that should be the course of development in mission fields, a united Lutheran Church would be able to make its impress on that national Church. In every way the call is for larger coöperation in mission work.

THE KOCHERTHAL RECORDS

(CONCLUDED)

J. CHRISTIAN KRAHMER

D. DEATHS, pages 177-179.

JESUS THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.

(JESU VIVICANTE).

Record of all High Germans of this colony who died since my arrival and during my residence at Newtown, on the west side of the Hudson. I either was present at the deaths of these persons and officiated at their funerals, or I was notified of their decease.

In the year 1713:

1. The child of Adam *Hertel*.
2. Adam *Soeller*.
3. Dec. 6th: Sibylla Charlotta *Kocherthal*.
4. The child of Arnold *Falck*.

In the year 1714:

1. Aug. 22d: Child of Hieronymus *Weller*.
2. Aug. 25th: Child of Clemens *Lehman*.

In the year 1715:

1. Jan. 21st: Mattheus *Brunck*, drowned.
2. March 9th: Child of Johann Reitz *Backus*.
3. March 17th: Johann Quirinius *Jung*.
4. March 20th: Wife of Andreas *Ellich*.
5. March 30th: Child of Jacob *Manck*.
6. April 9th: Gerhard *Hornung*.
7. Nov. 10th: Child of Johann *Planck*.
8. Nov. 15th: Wife of Johann *Planck*.
9. Dec. 8th: Child of Johann *Planck*.
10. Dec. 23d: Niclaus *Jung*, drowned.

In the year 1716:

1. Febr. 26th: Daughter of Johann *Fuehrer*.
2. March 21st: Wife of Adam *Hertel*.
3. Oct. 27th: Wife of Johann *Planck*.
4. (Not given): Child of Dorothea *Schaester*.

In the year 1717:

1. Sept. 1st: Child of Bernhard *Luckhard*.
2. Sept. 16th: Johann Fridrich *Contermann*.

In the year 1718:

1. March 23d: Elisabetha *Burckhard*, widow, age, 56 years.
2. Aug. 26th: Johann Balthasar *Aigner*, child of Peter *Aigner*, age, 1 day.

E. JESUS WILL REPAY. (Jesu Retribuente).

A list of articles which were obtained from time to time for the furtherance of our work and for the maintenance of church parsonage and schools, either voluntarily contributed and bequeathed by pious, Godfearing souls from pure and unselfish motives, or provided for and secured in some other way. Pages 221-222.

In the year 1708:

At my, Pastor Kocherthal's humble petition to their royal majesties, Queen Anne and Prince George, a bell, weighing 113 lbs., was donated for use in connection with our church services.

The following articles were procured by me and paid for from the proper funds:

A pewter chalice and paten for the administration of Holy Communion, for five shillings sterling, or according to current value, 7 and $\frac{1}{2}$ shilling.

In the year 1710:

This Church Record for which 6- $\frac{1}{2}$ shilling were paid to H. Bredfort.

For a small bell, weighing 42 lbs., 52 shilling sterling, current value 3 pounds 18 shillings, were paid.

For a second pewter set of chalice and paten for the administration of Holy Communion here in New York, 7- $\frac{1}{2}$ shilling were spent, and for pewter basin, 3 shilling, total 10- $\frac{1}{2}$ shilling.

For a round-iron (rund Eisen) for preparing bread for Holy Communion, 2- $\frac{1}{2}$ shilling were paid.

Maria Margretha, wife of Just Henrich Schäster, bequeathed upon our death-bed a white linen cloth for use upon the altar or table at the divine services.

In the year 1715:

Elisabetha, wife of Albrecht Dietrich Marterstock, also donated a white linen homespun cloth for use at the church services.

Anna Margretha, wife of Adam Bertold, donated a white cloth for use at church services; this was done in the month of December 1715.

In the year 1716:

Anna Maria Reichart donated a pewter basin for the administration of Holy Baptism.

In July, 1716, Anna Juliana, wife of Henrich Reuter, donated a printed chalice cloth for use at church services.

THE W. C. BERCKENMEYER ENTRIES

in the

KOCHERTHAL RECORDS

F. These entries are found on pages 77-80 and are as follows:

In the year 1725 during the Advent season there were baptized by me, W. C. Berckemeyer, Lutheran Pastor at New York:

Nov. 25th: Maria, child of Friderich (Reformed) and Maria (Lutheran) Schram; sponsor: Hieronymus Klein.

Nov. 25th: Anna Margareta, child of Friderich and Eva Dieterich; sponsors: Hans Wilhelm Dieterich, the grand-father, and his wife Anna Margareta.

- Nov. 28th: Johann Bastian, 6 weeks old, child of Andreas and Anna Barbara *Wiederwachs*; sponsors: Johann Bastian *Löscher*, the father-in-law, (socer) and Anna Sibilla *Müller*, the step-mother (noverca).
- Nov. 28th: Maria Margareta, born Nov. 27th, child of Johannes *Bernard*, commonly called *Spielmann*, and his wife Anna Eulalia; sponsors: Johann Emith *Saalbach*, commonly called *Hannemann*, and his wife Maria Margareta.
- Nov. 28th: Johann Jacob, 2 months old, child of Jürgen Henrich *Scherp*, (Reformed), and his wife Anna Barbara; sponsors: Jacob *Scherp*, the grand-father, and Anna Maria *Scherp*, the grand-mother.
- Nov. 28th: Maria Barbara, 8 days old, child of Jacob and Catharina *Zerber*; sponsors: Johannes *Leitz* and his wife Maria Barbara.
- Nov. 28th: Robert, 3 weeks old, child William *Loiner*, an Englishman, and his wife Abigail; sponsor: James *Kernick*.
- Nov. 28th: Catharina, 7 weeks old, child of Friderich and Catharina *Rau*; sponsors: Michael *Rau* and Elsie *Schneider*.
- Nov. 28th: Johann Hermann, 4 weeks old, child of Johann Jacob and Christina *Best*; sponsors: Hermann *Becker*, the father-in-law, (socer) and Catharina *Becker*.
- Nov. 28th: Johann Wilhelm, 7 weeks old, child of Georg Kilmer (Reformed), and his wife Eva Margareta, Lutheran; sponsor: Johann Wilhelm *Kunz*.
- Nov. 28th: Johannes, 8 days old, son of Johann and Elisabeth *Rusmann*; sponsors: Johann Jost *Propper* and his wife Anna Elisabeth.

Total number baptized in 1725, 11.

In the year 1726:

- Jan. 23d: Johannes Peter, born Jan. 18th, child of Peter and Catharina *Ham*, both Reformed; sponsors: Johann Peter *Philipp* and his wife Catharina.
- Jan. 23d: Johannes Peter, born Dec. 31, 1725, child of Justus Adam and Christina *Schmid*, both Reformed; sponsors: Peter *Philipp* and his wife Magdalena.
- Jan. 24th: Johannes and Anna Elisabeth, twins, about 6 weeks old, children of Johann Peter *Burckhard*, and his wife Amalia, Reformed; sponsors: Johann Hermann *Reuter* and his wife Anna Juliana for the boy, and Johann Jacob *Maul* for the girl.
- March 9th: Gertrudt, born Febr. 23d, child of Johann Matthias and Anna Veronica *Jung*, both Reformed; sponsors: Elisabetha *Klein*, Wilhelm *Schmid*, Gertrud *Falckenburg*.
- March 9th: Henrich, born March 5, child of Balthasar and Christina *Kiever*; sponsors: Henrich *Fees* and his wife Christina.

[The remaining entries on page 78, 6 in number, are scarcely discernible; and inasmuch as they have been made with a different kind of ink and in a different hand-writing and, apparently, are not a part of the W. C. Berckenmeyer entries, I did not attempt to translate them. J. C. K.]

In the year 1726, on October 12th, I, W. C. Berckenmeyer, baptized the following at Newtown:

1. Margareta, born July 21, child of Daniel and Catharina *Worms*; sponsors: Hans Willem *Dieterich* and his wife Margrete.
2. Anna Maria, born June 15th, child of Friderich and Anna Catharina *Streid*; sponsors: Paul *Smid* and Anna Margareta *Maul*.

3. Anna Maria, one and one half month old, child of Valentin and Catharina *Fuhrer*; sponsors: Friderich and Anna Maria *Schramm*.

In the year 1727, on June 14th I again (presumably at the same place) baptized:

1. Johannes, born June 8th, child of David and Margrete *Mul-ler*; sponsors: Johannes and Anna Sibilla *Ebbert*.
2. Margareta, born April 29th, child of Jurg Jan and Margrete *Decker*; sponsors: Willem *van Orde* and his wife *Tempe-rans*.

In the year 1728, on Jan. 24th, I conducted services at Kiskatom and baptized the following:

1. Catharina, born Dec. 12th, child of Balthasar and Christina *Kiever*; sponsors: Catharina *Emmerich* (the mother of the child acting in her place), and Hermannus *Behr*.
2. Maria, two months old, child of Peter and Mattie *Burgard*; sponsors: Friderich *Maul* and Maria *Klein*.
3. Liesabeth, born Oct. 7th, child of Nicklas and Liesabeth *Brandau*; sponsors: Hannes *Brandau* and Liesabeth *Reuter*.
4. Maria, three months old, child of Friderich and Eva *Dieterich*; sponsors: Jurge Willem *Köhl* and Maria Margreta *Graad*.

5. Catharina, born Nov. 19th, child of Christian and Margareta *Dieterich*; sponsors: Catharina *Schut* and Hans Jurge *Elig*.

May 2, 1728, I baptized the following in the church:

- Liesabeth, born sometime in February, child of Anna Margareta *Scheff*, who participated in the confessional and communion service; she was employed by Ernst *Wynsco* and his son Johannes is presumably the father of the child; sponsors: Georg Wilhelm *Köhl* and his wife Gertrud.
2. Anna Maria, born April 4th, child of Clement and Gertrud *Leman*; sponsors: Andreas *Eichler* and Anna Maria *Schef*.
3. Wilhelmus, born April 23d, child of Wilhelm and Maria Elisabeth *Schmid*; sponsors: Johann Wilhelm *Bransan* and Anna Maria *Oberbach*.

September 21, 1728, I baptized:

1. Margareetje, born Febr. 5th, child of Nicklas and Anna Elisabeth *Schmid* of Kiskatom; sponsors: Willem *Leman* and his wife Maria Eva.
2. Henrich, born Febr. 18th, child of Valentin and Catharina *Fuhrer*; sponsors: Henrich *Schram* and his wife Margareta.

In the year 1729, on April 16th, I baptized:

1. Johann Adam, born March 20th, child of Johann and Anna Margareta *Wolf*; sponsors: Adam *Spoon* and his wife Anna Maria.
2. Jannetje, born March 18th, child of Hendrick and Gebje *Korb* (Kort ?); sponsors: Hannes *Emmerich* and Jannetje *Wenne*.
3. Catharina, born March 12th, child of Michael and Anna Maria *Rauw*; sponsors: Wilhelm *Wambach* and his wife Catharina.
4. Gabriel, born April 3d, child of Gerrit and Gertrud *Decker*; sponsors: Gabriel *Graat* and his sister Greetje *Graat*.
5. Anna Catharina, born March 29th, child of Friderich and Eva *Dieterich*; sponsors: Gabriel *Graat* and Maria Catharina *Dieterich*.

March 11th, 1729, I baptized at Kiskatom:

- Johannes, born Jan. 10th, child of Jan Matthias and Anna Veronica *Jung*; sponsors: Johannes *Scheffer* and Maria Elizabeth *Schmidt*.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Problems of Evil and Sufferings. By Jeremiah Zimmerman, D.D., LL.D. Published by the Stratford Company, Boston, Mass. Pp. 305. Price \$2.00.

This is a new book on what is a very old subject. Every age, it would seem, is compelled to seek for its own solution. This is the justification for fresh attempts to solve the problems connected with evil and with sufferings.

The method of treatment indicates the purpose of the author. The problem of evil is first stated and the inadequacy of certain views of providence to account for it. This leads to a consideration of man, his freedom, and the abuse of it, or sin, as the cause of evil. Coming to the search for a solution of it, the author urges that all truth is to be welcomed, that faith and prayer are prime necessities of life and that it is only as men keep Christ and both worlds in view that they can hope for the antidote to the problem of evil. "Christ is the hope of the world and the only antidote for the problem of evil. He has triumphed over death and the grave. * * * The Apostle Paul fully realized the meaning and the power of the cross, and it satisfied all his needs. * * * That supreme sacrifice for others is the outstanding fact of history that must ever be emphasized. * * * There we have the boundless love of God expressed for us, and the worth of man according to God's estimate written in the blood of His own Son."

In discussing these questions, one is impressed with the wide range of the author's readings, travels and observations. Illustrations are drawn from many realms of thought and literature and from all lands. The attitude towards other religions with their attempted solutions is sympathetic at the same time that it does not overlook differences that are fundamental. It is a book that has a message for the perplexed. To us the book appeals most strongly because of its testimony. That one who has seen so much of life, of human evil and of good, should write such a book in the evening of life when not a few are cynical because of life's disappointments, and that it should conclude on a triumphant note of victory, itself gives fresh assurance to the believer in Jesus. It faces all the facts of evil; it is undaunted by them. The book has a message for all times but for none a more timely one than for the present.

JOHN ABERLY.

